REDUCED PRICE 3s. A COPY.

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION LIBRARY

LEVEL ONE

The Church Quarterly Review.

Edited by the Rev. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D.,
Professor of Dogmatic Theology, King's College, London.

No. 166. JANUARY 1917. Vol. LXXXIII.

CONTENTS:

PAGE

I. THE PROBLEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH. By the Rev. H. F. HAMILTON, D.D., Ottawa . . . 225

II. THE HYMNS OF ST. AMBROSE. By the Rev. A. S. WALPOLE, Hoggeston Rectory, Winslow . . . 252

III. THE CHURCH AND UNITY. By the Rev. E. GORDON SELWYN, Warden of Radley 270

IV. THE NATIONAL MISSION—A SUGGESTION, II. By the Rev. M. W. T. CONRAN, S.S.J.E. . . . 286

V. WHAT IS CATHOLICISM? By the Rev. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D. 292

VI. 'JEAN BAROIS.' THE FRANCE OF YESTER-YEAR. By MISS H. GRIERSON 329

VII. THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND STATE 347

VIII. THE WAR: A NEW CRISIS. 359

PROFESSOR HARNACK ON NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM. By the Rev. H. J. WHITE, D.D., Professor of New Testament Literature, King's College, London 390

SHORT NOTICES 394

INDEX TO VOL. LXXXIII 437

LONDON:
SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE & CO. LTD.
1 NEW-STREET SQUARE, E.C.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE 12s. PER ANNUM, POST-FREE.

MESSRS. SOTHERAN'S CATALOGUES.

JUST PUBLISHED, POST FREE.

CATALOGUE OF ZOOLOGY, an especially of Ornithology
(Price-Current No 767).

ANNOTATED CATALOGUE OF THEOLOGY, especially Anglican.
144 pages, 4,076 articles, 2s. 6d. post free.

HENRY SOTHERAN & CO., Booksellers, 140 STRAND, W.C., and 43 PICCADILLY, W.

A Speciality of BOOKS ON THE WAR at No. 43 Piccadilly.

CURATES' AUGMENTATION FUND.

PRESIDENTS:
His Grace the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, His Grace the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.
TREASURER: Rev. T. A. SEDGWICK.

This Society augments the stipends of Curates who have been more than 15 years in Holy Orders, and are still in full active work.

Of the **7,000** Curates very many have been ordained more than **15** years, and this number is annually increasing.

It is **the only Society in England** that directly increases the stipends of Curates of long standing. The **'QUEEN VICTORIA CLERGY FUND'** does not help the Unbeneficed Clergy.

The Church is multiplying Curates **three times** as rapidly as she is multiplying Benefices.

Nearly **£10,000** was voted last year in Grants.

The average stipend of those receiving Grants does not exceed **£3** a week.

CHURCH COLLECTIONS, SUBSCRIPTIONS & DONATIONS thankfully received.

Office: 2 DEAN'S YARD, WESTMINSTER, S.W. **Rev. A. C. B. ATKINSON,** *Secretary.*

H. R. ALLENSON'S NEW BOOKS

JUST OUT. A most helpful book. CLOTH, 2s. 6d. net.

DEATH AND LIFE

Some Letters from the Correspondence of a Parish Priest

Church Times.—'*Death and Life* consists of letters on such subjects as death and sin; the communion of saints; clairvoyance and spiritualism. They are intended to solve certain problems, and the letter stating the problem is always given as well as the answer. **The book is written out of a real spiritual knowledge and it ought to help many people.** There are some particularly wise words on the subject of spiritualism.'

The Challenge.—'The letters bring out most clearly and usefully the Catholic teaching concerning death, sin, and the Communion of Saints.'

JOHN MASON NEALE

SACKVILLE COLLEGE SERMONS

By the late Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. Handsome cloth, crown 8vo. each **2s. 6d.** net per vol.

Vol. I.—Advent to Lent—Thirty-one Sermons.

Vol. II.—Passiontide to Whitsuntide—Thirty-three Sermons.

Church Times.—'We can never have too much of Dr. Neale. Gladly, therefore, do we welcome a reprint of the Sackville College Sermons.'

SERMONS ON THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

Twenty-two Sermons By the late J. M. NEALE, D.D. **2s. 6d.** net. A fine new edition.

Church Times.—'Perfect Sermons.'

SERMONS FOR CHILDREN

By the late Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. Cloth, **2s.** net. A complete reprint of this famous volume.

Please write for our new **CATALOGUE,** 48 pages post free.

LONDON: H. R. ALLENSON, Ltd., Racquet Court, Fleet Street, E.C.

New S.P.C.K. Books.

A STUDY IN CHRISTOLOGY. The Problem of the Relation of the Two Natures in the Person of Christ. By HERBERT M. RELTON, D.D. With Preface by ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology in King's College, London. **7s. 6d.** net.

[An attempt at christological reconstruction in the light of modern thought.]

THE CALL OF LENT TO PENITENCE, DISCIPLINE, AND CHRIST. By H. C. G. MOULE, D.D., Bishop of Durham. **2s.** net.

[Short readings for each week day in Lent.]

DISCIPLESHIP. By A. H. McNEILE, D.D., C.F., Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. **2s.** net.

[The author of 'Self-Training in Prayer' develops the thought of Discipleship in the light of the experiences of the original disciples as they followed our Lord.]

THE CHRISTIAN ARMOUR. By the Rev. J. O. F. MURRAY, D.D., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge. **1s. 6d.** net. [*Ready Shortly.*

[Studies in personal religion based on St. Paul's great description of the Christian Soldier in Ephesians, chap. vi.]

JUST PUBLISHED.

THE HEBREW-CHRISTIAN MESSIAH; or, the Presentation of the Messiah to the Jews in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. By A. LUKYN-WILLIAMS, D.D., Vicar of Guilden Morden and Hon. Canon of Ely Cathedral, formerly Tyrwhitt Hebrew Scholar in the University of Cambridge. With an Introductory Note by the BISHOP OF ELY. 8vo, cloth, **10s. 6d.** net. (The Bishop Warburton Lectures, 1911-15.)

TRANSLATIONS OF EARLY DOCUMENTS. Under the joint editorship of the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D., and the Rev. Canon G. H. BOX, M.A. [A new and important series, which will give in a cheap form the chief documents that are essential for a study of the New Testament.]

Each **2s. 6d.** net:—

THE WISDOM OF BEN-SIRA (Ecclesiasticus). By the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D. (Generally known as Ecclesiasticus; the Revised Version of this book is, of course, obsolete since the recovery of the Hebrew Text.)

THE BOOK OF ENOCH.

THE TESTAMENTS of the TWELVE PATRIARCHS. By the Rev. R. H. CHARLES, D.Litt., D.D. With Introductions by the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D.

THE APOCALYPSE OF EZRA (4 Esdras). By the Rev. Canon BOX. [*In the Press.*

OTHERS IN PREPARATION.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

LONDON: 68 HAYMARKET, S.W.

And of all Booksellers.

MESSRS. LONGMANS & CO.'S LIST.

TEACHINGS OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES: Outlines for Meditations or Sermons on the Daily New Testament Lessons.
PART I.—**The Teachings of Christ.** By a PRIEST. With an Introduction by the Right REV. WILFRID HORNBY, D.D., Lord Bishop of Nassau. Large Cr. 8vo. 6*s.* net.

*** This book, in addition to providing suggestions for Meditations for every day for the year, supplies also two sermon outlines, one on the morning, the other on the evening New Testament Lesson, for every Sunday (except where a Proper Lesson is appointed) for three years and a half.

CONDUCT AND THE SUPERNATURAL. Being the Norrisian Prize Essay for the Year 1913. By the Rev. LIONEL SPENCER THORNTON, M.A., of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d. net.*

'This is a book for thinkers; a strong, sane, suggestive, and exhilarating discussion of the work of religion in making men.'—*London Quarterly Review.*

'The book of the hour. . . . One of the weightiest contributions to theological literature in recent years.'—*The Commonweal.*

BELIEF AND PRACTICE. By WILL SPENS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. 8vo. 6*s.*

'This book is the most important contribution to Christian apologetics that has appeared for a good while. . . It is a thoroughly sound defence of orthodoxy without the smallest tinge of bitterness or obscurantism.'—*The Challenge.*

THE MINISTRY IN THE CHURCH, in relation to Prophecy and Spiritual Gifts (Charismata). By the Rev. H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A., D.D. Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d. net.*

'An able criticism of the theory which distinguishes, in the Early Church, two kinds of ministry—one spiritual, universal, and peripatetic, the other consisting of Bishops, presbyters, deacons, a local ministry of an inferior type and engaged rather in management and discipline than in higher special functions. . . . A good example of logical and erudite controversy.'—*The Times.*

OUR PLACE IN CHRISTENDOM. Lectures delivered at St. Martin in the Fields in the Autumn of 1915. With a Preface by the BISHOP of LONDON. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d. net.*

'Unity and Authority in the Primitive Church.' By the Rev. Canon A. J. Mason, D.D.—'East and West.' By the Rev. W. H. Frere, D.D.—'Councils and Unity.' By the Rev. J. Neville Figgis, D.D.—'National Churches.' By the Rev. J. Neville Figgis, D.D.—'The Mediæval Church in the West.' By the Rev. J. P. Whitney, B.D.—'The Papacy and the Reformation.' By the Rev. J. P. Whitney, D.D.—'Intellectual and Moral Liberty in the Church.' By the Right Rev. C. Gore, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford.—'The Nineteenth Century.' By the Rev. Canon H. S. Holland, D.D.—'The Vocation of the Church of England.' By the Rev. Canon A. W. Robinson, D.D.

THE HOLY TRINITY. By the Right Rev. LOUIS GEORGE MYLNE, M.A., Hon. D.D. (Oxon.), Rector of Alvechurch, Worcestershire, sometime Bishop of Bombay. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE FULNESS OF CHRIST. By the Right Rev. FRANK WESTON, D.D., Bishop of Zanzibar, Author of 'The One Christ.' Crown 8vo. 6*s.* net.

FORM AND CONTENT IN THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION. A Friendly Discussion between W. SANDAY, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor and Canon of Christ Church, and N. P. WILLIAMS, M.A., Chaplain-Fellow of Exeter College. 8vo. 6*s. net.*

NATURE, MIRACLE AND SIN: A Study of St. Augustine's Conception of the Natural Order. By T. A. LACEY, M.A. The Pringle Study Lectures delivered at Oxford, Easter Term, 1914. 8vo. 6*s.* net.

LETTERS OF THE REV. H. H. JEAFFRESON. Edited by the Rev. C. E. LAMBERT, M.A., Vicar of All Hallows Barking by the Tower. With a Foreword by the BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, a Portrait and a Short Memoir. Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d. net.*

SERMON NOTES: First Series, Anglican. By the late Monsignor ROBERT HUGH BENSON. Edited by Rev. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J. Cr. 8vo. [*Nearly Ready.*

WORKS BY THE RIGHT REV. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., late Bishop of Oxford. Cheaper Re-issues. Cr. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d. net* each Volume. 'The Spirit of Discipline.' Sermons, together with an Introductory Essay concerning Accidie. 'Studies in the Christian Character': Sermons. 'Faculties and Difficulties for Belief and Disbelief.'

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., 39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, and MADRAS.

FROM MOWBRAYS' LIST.

FOURTH IMPRESSION, COMPLETING TWENTY-TWO THOUSAND COPIES.

THE RELIGION OF THE CHURCH
AS PRESENTED IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
A Manual of Membership
By the Right Rev. CHARLES GORE, D.D., Bishop of Oxford.

Paper, **1s.** net; Cloth, **1s. 6d.** net.

'The Bishop of Oxford has done an immense service by endeavouring in his own words to "meet a need which is just now clamorous—the provision of a manual of instruction for the members of the Church of England."'—*Church Times.*

'Admirably adapted to its purpose. Brevity, simplicity of style, boldness and clearness in exposition or investigation, freedom from such over-restraint as often comes from official caution, frankness in stating the duties of membership and in suggesting measures of reform are all marks which will go to make the book of service to the average member of the Church.'—*The Challenge.*

SECOND IMPRESSION IN THE PRESS.

HERE AND THERE IN THE WAR AREA. By the Right Rev. HERBERT BURY, D.D., Bishop for Northern and Central Europe, Author of 'Russian Life To-day.' With 32 Illustrations. Cloth, **3s. 6d.** net.

'We hope that this volume may have as warm a welcome as that which preceded it. It is not only most attractive in its narration of experience, but it offers a corrective of depression which may have great value at the present moment.'—*Church Times.*

'A stimulating and absorbingly interesting story.'—*Church Family Newspaper.*

'It would be strange if a book made out of such material were not interesting, and though Bishop Bury tells no wonderful tales and spins no romantic yarns, his simple, straightforward story makes a natural appeal to the sympathy and understanding of the reader.'—*The Scotsman.*

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH. Short Addresses. By the Rev. B. W. RANDOLPH, D.D., Canon of Ely. A Series of Instructions designed to set forth Catholic doctrine on the Sacraments as clearly and simply as possible. Paper, **1s.** net; Cloth, **1s. 6d.** net.

'This book is just as good as it is possible to be. . . . It is exactly what clergy and teachers want, and would give them a perfect model upon which to base instructions of their own.'—*Commonwealth.*

SECOND IMPRESSION.

LETTERS OF RICHARD MEUX BENSON, Founder and First Superior of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley. Selected and Arranged by the Rev. GEORGE CONGREVE, S.S.J.E., and the Rev. W. H. LONGRIDGE, S.S.J.E., with special contributions by the BISHOP OF OXFORD, BISHOP HALL, Dr. DARWELL STONE, and others. With Three Portraits. Cloth, **5s.** net.

'The book is a treasury of love and truth, golden grain with all second-rate stuff sifted out by a mind that would have no half-truths.'—*Church Quarterly Review.*

NEW EDITION JUST PUBLISHED.

THE DIVINE RULE OF PRAYER; Or, Considerations upon the Lord's Prayer, with Various Forms of Analysis and Paraphrase. By the late Rev. R. M. BENSON, M.A., of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley. With a Preface by the Rev. G. CONGREVE, M.A. **1s. 6d.** net; cloth, **2s.** net.

'It would be impossible to find a more beautiful and suggestive book than this, or one more calculated to show how inexhaustible are the spiritual treasures enshrined in the Lord's Prayer.'—*The Challenge.*

CORAM DEO. Exercises in Mental Prayer for Beginners. By GEORGE D. CARLETON, B.D., of the Society of the Sacred Mission. With a Foreward by the Rev. DAVID JENKS. **2s. 6d.** net.

'The beginner in the difficult art of meditation could hardly have a more admirable aid to his devotion.' *The Challenge.*

NINTH YEAR OF ISSUE. **1s. 6d.** net paper; **2s.** net cloth.

THE CHURCHMAN'S YEAR-BOOK & ENCYCLOPÆDIA (Mowbrays' Annual, 1917). 392 pages. The Cheapest and most complete Annual for Church-people ever published.

'A "What's What" and a "Who's Who" in one.'—*The Times.*

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO., Ltd., 28 MARGARET ST., OXFORD CIRCUS, LONDON, W.: and 9 HIGH ST. OXFORD.

. . THE . .

NINETEENTH CENTURY

AND AFTER.

XIX–  –XX

FOUNDED BY JAMES KNOWLES.

The FEBRUARY Number contains :—

'IS IT PEACE, JEHU?'

(1) **No Peace without Victory.** By Charles E. Mallet (*formerly Financial Secretary to the War Office*).

(2) **Some Perils of Peace.** By the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

THE GREAT NAVAL BLOCKADE. By John Leyland.

THE PASSING OF THE CABINET. By Sir Francis Piggott (*late Chief Justice of Hong Kong*).

FRANCE AND THE RHINE FRONTIER. By J. Holland Rose, Litt.D.

DANZIG: Poland's Outlet to the Sea. By L. B. Namier.

'BONS CAMARADES' IN A WAR ZONE CANTINE. By Sir Frank Benson.

DIET AND DEBT. By the Right Hon. the Earl of Dunraven, K.P.

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN WAR. By Dr. Arthur Shadwell.

INDIA'S EFFORT: is it sufficiently understood? By A. Yusuf Ali.

LIFE AFTER DEATH:

(1) **Communication with the Dead: a Reply to Sir Herbert Stephen.** By Sir Oliver Lodge, F.R.S.

(2) **Future Life—and Lives.** By A. P. Sinnett.

THE NATIONAL GALLERY BILL, AND SIR HUGH LANE'S BEQUEST. By D. S. MacColl.

TOWARDS INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY. By B. Seebohm Rowntree.

INDUSTRIAL FATIGUE. By C. K. Ogden.

THE WAR POETRY OF WOMEN. By Lilian Rowland Brown (*Rowland Grey*).

MIGRATION AND THE DOMINIONS: Suggestions for the Imperial War Conference. By Sir Clement Kinloch-Cooke, M.P.

COMPULSORY SERVICE IN AUSTRALIA. By the Hon. C. G. Wade, K.C., M.L.A. (*formerly Prime Minister of New South Wales*).

OF ALL RAILWAY BOOKSTALLS AND BOOKSELLERS.

London: SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE & CO. Ltd.
1 New-street Square, E.C.

HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN

NOW READY.

The Committee of HYMNS ANCIENT & MODERN have compiled

A SECOND SUPPLEMENT

Containing 141 Hymns intended for use with the Old Edition

MUCH APPROVED AND ALREADY ADOPTED IN MANY CHURCHES.

ither SEPARATELY or BOUND with the OLD EDITION is NOW READY:

	HYMNS ONLY.	Suppt. only. s.	d.	Suppt. with Old Edition. No.	s.	d.
No. 91—32mo.	Pearl, double columns, stitched	0	½	—	—	
No. 92—32mo.	Pearl, double columns, plain cloth, limp ...	0	1	2 s	0	3
No. 93—32mo.	Pearl, double columns, cloth limp, turned in	0	2	3 s	0	4
No. 95—32mo.	Pearl, single column, cloth boards, turned in	0	2	7 s	0	8
No. 96—32mo.	Nonpareil, cloth boards, turned in	0	3	10 s	1	0
No. 97—18mo.	Long Primer, cloth boards, turned in ...	0	4	13 s	1	3
No. 98—16mo.	Pica, cloth boards, turned in	0	9	16 s	2	6

HYMNS with ACCOMPANYING TUNES to the SECOND SUPPLEMENT
and with many ADDITIONAL TUNES for alternative use with some of the Hymns in the Old Edition.

No. 99—16mo.	Nonpareil, cloth boards, turned in	1	0	31 s	2 6
No. 100—Imperial 16mo.	Long Primer, cloth boards, turned in	2	0	—	—

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

COMBINED WITH H. A. & M. AND SECOND SUPPLEMENT

(PRAYER RUBY 32mo, AND HYMNS SIZE OF No. 3.)

No. 200 s. Purple Cloth, blind blocked. Price **8d.**; or post free, **10d.**

FOR USE IN TIME OF WAR

AN APPENDIX TO H. A. & M.

VORDS ONLY. stitched, ½d. per copy; 50 copies, 1s. 9d., by post 2s. 1d.; 100 copies, **3s.**, by post 3s. 5d.

VORDS AND TUNES, stitched, **1d.** per copy; 25 copies, **1s. 9d.**, by post 2s.; 50 copies, **3s.**, by post 3s. 5d.; 100 copies, **5s. 6d.**, by post 6s.

Music Folio, Purple or Crimson Cloth, price **5s.**; by post 5s. 6d. net.

VARIED HARMONIES FOR ORGAN ACCOMPANIMENT
(and Voice *ad libitum*) of certain Tunes in Hymns A. & M.

SPECIAL GRANTS will be made where needed to facilitate the introduction of the Supplement, or of the other Editions of Hymns A. & M. ddress The Chairman of the Hymns Committee, c/o the Publishers.

The Terms are strictly Cash, and no discount can be allowed from the xed net prices.

London: WILLIAM CLOWES & SONS, Ltd., 31 Haymarket, S.W.

NOW READY.

FIFTY-SEVENTH ISSUE

Super Royal 8vo. Handsomely Bound. Price 50s.

WALFORD'S COUNTY FAMILIES

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM

FOR

1917

There is included an Index of Family Names, arranged under the several Counties, and an Index to the Principal Seats in the United Kingdom, arranged alphabetically

LONDON:
SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE & CO. LTD.,
1 NEW-STREET SQUARE, E.C.

KING'S COLLEGE,
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.
(DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY.)

Dean—The Rev. A. CALDECOTT, D.D.

FACULTY of ARTS.

Students of the College can take the Degree of B.A. as Internal Students after three ars' study in the College; as External Students at any time not less than three years m their original Matriculation. The College provides instruction in all the usual ojects. The University has now included Theology as one of the subjects which may be ken for the B.A. degree.

FACULTY of THEOLOGY.

The Degree of B.D. in the University can be obtained by Graduates in Arts after two ars' study, by other Matriculated Students after three years.

The Associateship of King's College is accepted at present by most Bishops as the ademic qualification for admission to Holy Orders. It can be obtained by Graduates in ts after one year's Theological study; by others who have passed certain examinations school, or later, after two years' study; and by others after a year of Preliminary study d the two years' ordinary Theological course.

A considerable portion of the study may be taken in the Evening Department.

There are Entrance Exhibitions both for Graduates and for other Students.

Staff.

OGMATIC THEOLOGY: Rev. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D., Professor; Rev. W. R. MATTHEWS, M.A., B.D., Lecturer.

KEGESIS OF NEW TESTAMENT: Rev. H. J. WHITE, D.D., Professor; Rev. S. C. E. LEGG, M.A., Assistant Professor; Rev. S. KIRSHBAUM-KNIGHT, M.A., B.D., Lecturer.

EBREW AND EXEGESIS OF OLD TESTAMENT: Rev. Canon A. NAIRNE, M.A., D.D., Professor; Rev. H. F. B. COMPSTON, M.A., Assistant Professor.

ABBINICAL HEBREW: Rev. Canon G. H. BOX, M.A., Lecturer.

YRIAC AND ARAMAIC: Rev. S. C. E. LEGG, M.A.

SSYRIAN: L. W. KING, M.A., Litt.D., Professor.

ATRISTIC TEXTS: Rev. CLAUDE JENKINS, M.A., Lecturer.

OCLESIASTICAL HISTORY: Rev. J. P. WHITNEY, B.D., D.C.L., Professor.

ASTORAL AND LITURGICAL THEOLOGY: Rev. C. F. ROGERS, M.A., Lecturer; Rev. F. S. MARSH, Assistant Lecturer.

ENTAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY: Rev. A. CALDECOTT, D.D., D.Lit., Professor; Rev. W. R. MATTHEWS, M.A., B.D., Lecturer.

USIC: J. E. VERNHAM, Professor.

LOCUTION: F. J. KIDSON, Lecturer.

CHAPLAIN: Rev. S. C. E. LEGG, M.A.

FEES.

For the Arts Course	**21 Guineas a year.**
Evening Classes ...	**10 Guineas a year.**
For the Theological Course ...	**30 Guineas a year.**
Evening Classes ...	**£18 a year.**

NOTE.—These arrangements are subject to alteration during the continuance of the ar. In particular, the Evening Classes will not re-open in October.

For full information apply to the SECRETARY, KING'S COLLEGE, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

CHARITY ORGANISATION SOCIETY.

OFFICES OF THE COUNCIL:

DENISON HOUSE, VAUXHALL BRIDGE ROAD, S.W.

Patron—HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN.

President—

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

Chairman—Dr. BERNARD BOSANQUET.

Treasurers—Sir H. B. PRAED, Bart., G. T. PILCHER, Esq., and G. J. MARJORIBANKS, Esq.

I. **OBJECT.**—To organise charitable effort and to improve the condition of the poor by

I.—Propagating sound principles and views on the administration of charity and social work generally.

II.—Co-operation and combination with official and voluntary agencies and charitable persons.

III.—Procuring for the needy suitable and adequate assistance after thorough investigation, interim aid being given when necessary.

IV.—To discourage at once imposture and inefficient charitable action.

II. **METHODS.**—District Committees have been established in every part of London. Their duties are

I.—To act as a nucleus for charitable workers within the District.

II.—To deal with all cases of distress brought to their notice.

The Council are the representative governing body of the Society. They furnish gratuitously, to all who desire it, information and advice on general questions on particular Institutions, and issue publications for the same purpose.

Similar Societies have been established also in many important towns.

The *CHARITY ORGANISATION REVIEW*, the official organ of the Society, published throughout the year, is sent post free for a year for 7s. 6d.

Contributions for the work of the Society are earnestly requested, and may be paid at the Central Office, Denison House, Vauxhall Bridge Road, S.W. or to the account of the 'Charity Organisation Society' with Messrs. COUTTS & Co., 440 Strand, W.C.

J. C. PRINGLE, *Secretary.*

THE

CORPORATION OF THE CHURCH HOUSE,

Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.

President:

HIS GRACE THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

Vice-Presidents:

THE RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

THE RIGHT HON. LORD ASHCOMBE.

The Council:

Ex-Officio Members.

The LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, *President.*

The LORD HIGH CHANCELLOR OF GREAT BRITAIN.

The LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

The LORD BISHOP OF LONDON, *Vice-President.*

The DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

The PROLOCUTOR OF THE LOWER HOUSE OF THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY.

The PROLOCUTOR OF THE LOWER HOUSE OF THE CONVOCATION OF YORK.

Elected Members.

The LORD ASHCOMBE, *Vice-President.*

The DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE, K.G., G.C.V.O.

The LORD BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS.

The HON. RICHARD STRUTT.

MR. JUSTICE SANKEY.

SIR LEWIS T. DIBDIN.

The ARCHDEACON OF NOTTINGHAM.

HARRY LLOYD, Esq.

FRED. A. WHITE, Esq.

THE CHURCH HOUSE is the CENTRAL BUSINESS HOUSE of the Church of England and other Churches in communion with her.

In it CONVOCATION and the HOUSE OF LAYMEN for the Province of Canterbury hold their Sessions, and the REPRESENTATIVE CHURCH COUNCIL also sits here. FIFTY-THREE CHURCH SOCIETIES have their Offices in the Building, and OVER 800 MEETINGS are held annually in the Halls and Committee Rooms.

There is a valuable LIBRARY and READING ROOM furnished with Church Papers from all over the World.

Members of the Corporation have the PRIVILEGE OF TAKING BOOKS OUT OF THE LIBRARY, they have the use of the Public Rooms, and they can have their letters addressed to the Church House and forwarded as may be desired.

CONDITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP.

Membership of the Corporation may be acquired by persons of either sex (being Members of the Church of England or of any Church in full Communion therewith) by an Annual Subscription of at least One Guinea; Life Membership by a Donation in one sum of at least Ten Guineas. Associates are admitted on the payment of Five Shillings a year on the recommendation of a Member.

The Council appeal for Funds towards the much needed extension of the permanent building.

SYDNEY W. FLAMANK, *Secretary.*

LAST APPEAL. Still required £384 to keep the Homes going.

CANON NEWBOLT

speaks to Readers of the 'Church Quarterly Review.'

THE RESCUE OF CHILDREN

I AM constrained once more to put forward, on behalf of the Church Penitentiary Association, a very earnest plea in a branch of their work, which they have undertaken under the pressing constraint of an appalling need, and in the faith of receiving support from the awakened sympathy of a Christian Nation.

It is impossible to shut our eyes to the fact that there is a great and increasing spread of corruption among little children of an age which varies from five to fifteen.

The nature of this corruption is two-fold.

1. Poor little girls, not knowing what evil means, are assaulted by those who trade on their ignorance, and are thus morally injured and contaminated, with life poisoned at its very spring;

2. Then, in too many cases, it is found that they themselves, partly from ignorance, and partly from the evil which they have learned, become sources of contamination to others, and constitute a plague spot which the Authorities in some cases feel constrained even to exclude from their schools.

The statistics received from various Rescue workers are such as would stagger those who do not know the urgency of the matter. In these circumstances, largely owing to the generous help from the public which former appeals had brought in, the Church Penitentiary Association has purchased premises and opened two Rescue Homes for Children—one at Wolverhampton and one at Croydon. Considerable expenditure has been incurred in adapting the premises, and both are certified by the Home Office as Industrial Schools, and children can be committed to them by the Magistrates. That at Wolverhampton is quite full and is going splendidly. That at Croydon, which has been more recently started, is also filling.

There is a hope that both these Homes, with payments from the Treasury and Guardians, and others interested in the children, together with local help, may become independent of support from the Association. At the present moment, however, a sum of at least £1,600 is needed, to cover large initial expenses, and to give the Home a fair start.

I venture, therefore, most earnestly to appeal, in the Name of Christ the Good Shepherd, Who carries the lambs in His arms, that generous help may be given us in this work, which has been undertaken almost under a moral compulsion, to roll away in some way, if we can, this reproach from Christian England, and to help the children who cry out to us in the hideous wrong they have suffered, and from which we fain would rescue them.

Donations will be gladly received by me at 3 Amen Court.

W. C. E. NEWBOLT,
Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral.

3 AMEN COURT, E.C.

P.S.—Prompt help must be given if this great work is to continue.

FUNERALS

Conducted in Proper Form and with Appropriate Fittings, APPROVED OF BY THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL SOCIETY, and Recommended by the Clergy, by

THOMAS VIGERS,

Undertaker to the Guild of S. Alban.

MAKER OF THE COMBINED HAND AND WHEEL BIER.

PALLS AND MORTUARY CHAMBER FITTINGS LENT ON HIRE.

MONUMENTAL MASON.

3 ECCLESTON STREET, BUCKINGHAM PALACE ROAD, LONDON, S.W.

Telephone No. 4554 VICTORIA. Telegrams: 'GLOOMY, LONDON.'

Branch: 47 CRAWFORD STREET, BRYANSTON SQUARE, W.

Telephone No. 117 PADDINGTON.

VALUER FOR PROBATE, &c.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Founded 1856.

THINK OF WHAT WE OWE TO OUR SAILORS.

Funds are urgently needed to enable the Church to minister to the Spiritual and Social needs of our

BRITISH SEAMEN,

who guard our coasts, and bring our food.

The Crews of our Warships, Mine-sweeping Trawlers, Transports and Merchant Vessels, and the men of the Royal Naval Brigade in Holland, are all cared for by the Chaplains, and other Workers of this Society, at its Seamen's Churches and Institutes in **110 Ports at Home and Abroad.**

Please send a New Year's Gift as a Thank-offering for your Food, brought to you by Sailors in spite of Submarines and Mines.

STUART C. KNOX, M.A., Secretary,

The MISSIONS to SEAMEN, 11 Buckingham Street, Strand, London, W.C.



BY APPOINTMENT TO THE LATE KING EDWARD VII. . . . .

STAINED GLASS WINDOWS. CHURCH DECORATIONS . .

Memorial Brasses.

Mosaics. Tablets, &c.

CHURCHES VISITED. ESTIMATES AND DESIGNS FURNISHED FREE OF CHARGE.

HEATON, BUTLER & BAYNE,

14 GARRICK STREET, LONDON, W.C.,

AND NEW YORK.

Illustrated List of Churches in all parts of the World, where examples of the firm's work may be seen, will be forwarded on application.

Unlike the ordinary so-called 'Pick-me-ups' KOLA TONIC is a delicious drink which can be taken as a liqueur or mixed with water as a beverage.

KOLA LIQUEUR

Tonic. Stimulating. Non-Alcoholic.



The Times says: 'It is an excellent nerve tonic, and is especially good for keeping the brain clear and active.'

The Daily Telegraph says: 'The properties of this wonderful food are said to be almost magical; it is at once stimulant and food, and contains within a given space more nutriment and more capacity for sustaining life than any other natural or prepared article.'

Kola is estimated to be *five times* as sustaining as Cocoa, and also possesses the stimulating properties of Tea.

This nerve stimulant and food, although little known in Europe, finds a ready sale in tropical countries, where its value as a remedy against enervating climatic conditions has been well recognised for the past 25 years.

It can be obtained at all the leading stores in the following countries:—

East and West Indies, S. Africa, Siam, Bolivia, Australia, Tasmania, &c., &c.

Send postcard for Price List and name of nearest Agent to

The PURE WATER Co. Ltd.,
QUEEN'S ROAD, BATTERSEA PARK, LONDON, S.W.

See that you get the Pure Water Coy.'s Iceberg Brand which is prepared from the Kola Fruit.

Messrs. WATTS & CO., Ltd.,

Church Furnishers and Ecclesiastical Embroiderers.

VESTMENTS, FRONTALS, & BANNERS.
From the Designs of the Architects mentioned below.

EMBROIDERY AND TEXTILE FABRICS.
DAMASK SILKS.
STAMPED AND PLAIN VELVETS.
WOVEN STUFFS FOR HANGINGS.
ALTAR LINEN.

EMBROIDERY

DONE UNDER CAREFUL SUPERVISION AND ALSO PREPARED FOR LADIES' OWN WORKING.
Special pains taken to secure beauty of colour.

MEMORIAL BRASSES.

CROSSES,
CANDLESTICKS,
VASES,

BRASS AND OAK LECTERNS, AND ALTAR VESSELS

MATERIALS FOR THE FURNITURE OF CHURCHES AND HOUSES.

WALL PAPERS & PRINTED & WOVEN STUFFS FOR WALL HANGINGS.

All Articles from Designs of G. F. BODLEY, Esq., R.A., the late G. GILBERT SCOTT, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., T. GARNER, Esq., and J. L. DAVENPORT, Esq., M.A.

30 Baker Street, Portman Square, W.

THE GREATEST ASSET
OF A NATION
IS ITS CHILDREN.

THE
WAIFS & STRAYS SOCIETY

has saved and trained over **21,000** little ones. Present family numbers **4,714.** Over **1,000** children whose fathers or guardians are on active service have been provided for.

PLEASE HELP by sending a contribution to
PREBENDARY RUDOLF,
Old Town Hall, Kennington Road, London, S.E.
Cheques, etc., ***CROSSED*** *and payable to* ***'WAIFS AND STRAYS.'***

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *says* :—
No one who keeps his eyes open to facts as they are can doubt the increasing interest and importance of

The Church Family Newspaper.

The contributors to the *Church Family Newspaper* include Dr. A. BENSON (who is responsible for a weekly causerie), the BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, Professor BONNEY, Professor MARGOLIOUTH, Professor EDMUND BARNES, Lord ROBERT CECIL, Lord PARMOOR, Dean INGE, Canon MASTERMAN, Chancellor SMITH, etc.

All the Important Church News of the week—A Sermon by an Eminent Preacher—Signed Book Reviews.

EVERY FRIDAY—ONE PENNY. All Newsagents.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: 6s. 8d. Inland; 8s. 8d. Foreign.
A Specimen Copy gladly sent on receipt of postcard.

'THE CHURCH FAMILY NEWSPAPER,' 17 Tavistock St., LONDON, W.C.

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. 166. JANUARY 1917. VOL. LXXXIII.

For List of Articles see Cover.

SHORT NOTICES.

PAGE

I. BIBLICAL STUDIES 394

Amos and Hosea. *By* A. Tweedie.—*Jonah.* *By* T. H. Dodson.—*St. Mark.* *By* the Archdeacon of Manchester.—*St. Mark.* *By* A. Plummer.—*Romans.* *By* R. St. John Parry.—*St. James.* *By* J. H. Ropes.—*St. James.* *By* H. Maynard Smith.

II. PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION 399

God and Freedom in Human Experience. *By* the Bishop of Down.—*Immanence and Christian Thought.* *By* F. Platt.—*The Problem of Evil.*—*Nature and God.* *By* T. A. Lacey.—*Nature, Miracle and Sin.* *By* T. A. Lacey.—*Concerning Prayer.*—*Deliverance.* *By* H. O. Taylor.—*The Philosophy of Religion.* *By* G. Galloway.—*Confucianism and its Rivals.* *By* H. A. Giles.

III. PATRISTIC TEXTS 411

Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum auctore Rufino and *Rufinus' Commentary on the Apostles' Creed.* *By* E. F. Morison.—*Vincentius' Commonitorium.* *By* R. S. Moxon.

IV. SERMONS AND DEVOTIONAL STUDIES 415

The Ideals of the Prophets. *By* the late S. R. Driver.—*A Prophet's Visions and the War.* *By* T. W. Crafer.—*An Interpreter of War, Habakkuk.* *By* G. Gordon.—*The Lord in His Temple.* *By* H. P. Denison.—*Father Stanton's Last Sermons.*

V. HISTORY 419

The Archbishops of St. Andrews, V. *By* J. Herkless and R. K. Hannay.

PERIODICALS AND BOOKS RECEIVED 421

PROTECTION FROM FIRE

BRYANT & MAY'S

"BRYMAY"

SAFETY MATCHES

33 AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE.

MACMILLAN & CO.'S NEW BOOKS.

DR. H. B. SWETE.

THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS. A Study in the Apostles' Creed. By the **Rev. Henry Barclay Swete, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.** Crown 8vo. **2s. 6d.** net.

THE GUARDIAN. 'There is such a thorough treatment of his material, such a sure touch in exegesis of Holy Scripture, such a penetration into the central heart of his subject, and all this combined with a spiritual instinct which makes it pleasant to appreciate and a difficult task to criticise.'

REV. WILLIAM TEMPLE.

MENS CREATRIX: An Essay. By **William Temple,** Rector of St. James's Piccadilly; Hon. Chaplain to H.M. the King; Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Demy 8vo. **7s. 6d.** net.

COMPETITION: A STUDY OF HUMAN MOTIVE. By **H. G. Wood,** Warden of Woodbrooke Settlement; **J. St. G. Heath,** Warden of Toynbee Hall; the **Rev. M. Spencer,** Secretary of the Free Church Fellowship; and the **Rev William Temple, M.A.** Crown 8vo. [*Shortly*

PROVIDENCE AND FAITH. Extracts from a Churchman's Diary. By **William Scott Palmer.** With an Introduction by **Rev. C. H. S Matthews,** Editor of 'Faith or Fear?' Crown 8vo. [*Shortly.*

AUTHOR OF 'PRO CHRISTO ET ECCLESIA.'

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF HEALTH. A Handbook on the Relation of Bodily to Spiritual and Moral Health. By the **Author of 'Pro Christo et Ecclesia.'** Crown 8vo. **2s.** net.

THE PROBLEM OF PERSONALITY. A Critical and Constructive Study in the Light of Recent Thought. By **Ernest Northcroft Merrington, M.A., Ph.D.** Crown 8vo. **5s.**

ECCLESIASTES; OR, THE CONFESSIONS OF AN ADVENTUROUS SOUL. A practical application of the Book of Koheleth called Ecclesiastes. By **Minos Devine, M.A.** Crown 8vo. **4s. 6d.** net.

THE GUARDIAN.—'The work is a sufficient and valuable handbook to "Ecclesiastes," and provides all that any non-technical reader will desire or need to know about that strangely fascinating piece of Jewish literature. A word of praise is due to the careful and excellent Index which is provided.'

THOUGHTS ON RELIGION AT THE FRONT. By the **Rev. Neville S. Talbot,** Assistant Chaplain-General. Crown 8vo. **2s.** net.

ESSAYS IN ORTHODOXY. By the **Rev. Oliver Chase Quick,** Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Crown 8vo. **6s.** net.

WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST? Being Lectures on the Incarnation and its Interpretation in Terms of Modern Thought. By the **Rev. Charles E. Raven, M.A.** Crown 8vo. **4s. 6d.** net.

CONTENTS.—I. Man's Knowledge of God. II. The Oneness of Jesus. III. The Many-Sidedness of Jesus. IV. The Divinity of Jesus. V. Man's Salvation through Jesus.

CHURCH DIVISIONS AND CHRISTIANITY. By **W. Leighton Grane,** Prebendary of Chichester, Author of 'Hard Sayings of Jesus Christ,' 'The Passing of War,' etc. 8vo. **5s.** net.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY. By **R. G. Collingwood,** Fellow and Lecturer of Pembroke College, Oxford. 8vo. **5s.** net.

BRAHMA-DARSANA; OR, INTUITION OF THE ABSOLUTE. Being an Introduction to the Study of Hindu Philosophy. By **Sri Ananda Acharya.** Crown 8vo. [*Shortly.*

SAINT MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON, W.C.

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. CLXVI. *January* 1917.

Art. I.—THE PROBLEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

1. *The Problem of the Commonwealth.* By L. Curtis. (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd. 1916.)
2. *The Commonwealth of Nations. An Inquiry into the Nature of Citizenship in the British Empire and into the mutual Relations of the several Communities thereof.* Part 1. Edited by L. Curtis. (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd. 1916.)

The British Empire[1] is at present the object of an extra-

[1] It is characteristic of Mr. Curtis and the *Round Table* group of writers to speak of the 'British Commonwealth' rather than of the 'British Empire.' The change is significant. 'Empire' suggests conquest and subjugation, the dominion of one race or people over another; its correlative 'Emperor' conveys the idea of despotic rule, of one who issues his orders to his subjects and receives directions from none. 'Commonwealth,' on the other hand, suggests at once the self-government of a free people, the devotion of the individual to the public good in a spirit of service, rather than the rule of an individual over others in a spirit of autocracy. Of the two, 'Commonwealth' certainly conveys a more accurate idea of the way in which the Anglo-Saxon subjects of King George are governed, or rather, govern themselves. But yet there are reasons why the term 'Empire' is to be preferred and will probably be retained. (1) 'Commonwealth' has no cognates to take the place of 'Emperor' and 'Imperial.' It will be exceedingly difficult to avoid the use of these two terms, and if they are retained, it seems a little unreasonable to reject 'Empire.' (2) For modern

ordinary amount of self-devotion and moral enthusiasm. In the Dominions the war has been taken up as though it were a Crusade, as the battlefields of Flanders, of Gallipoli and of the German possessions in South-West and East Africa bear witness. The same consecration of self to a great ideal, the same spirit of moral enthusiasm speak to us from the pages of Mr. Curtis' book. Not the soldier only, but the statesman and thinker also find an inspiration in the thought of the Empire. Such devotion as this must have its roots in the past and its face set towards the future. Somehow or other, men have come to see that in the past the Empire has stood for something worthy of admiration and of self-devotion, and that for the future it holds out prospects even more noble and attractive.

No doubt there are still some people in whom the whole subject evokes little or no response. If this is so, it is probably because the thought of the Empire is associated in their minds with the idea of size and numbers and of favourable comparison in this respect with other Empires; and so enthusiasm for the Imperial idea seems to them to be indicative of an unlovely spirit of national pride, of self-congratulation and vain-glory. If so, it is little wonder that they find the whole subject dull and uninspiring; they have not seen the vision nor understood the secret. When we see Dutchmen from South Africa and Frenchmen from Canada joining hand in hand with Maoris from New Zealand and Sikhs and Gurkhas from India and, with men of a hundred races from other parts of the world, willingly risking their lives to uphold a British Empire, it is surely plain that the size of that Empire is a mere accident; its true compelling greatness lies elsewhere. Let us try then, first of all, to estimate the moral value of the Empire to the world and to see what is the secret of the widespread devotion which it is capable of calling forth.

British ears 'Empire' has lost its autocratic significance and has even gained a place in our affections. Any soldier from the Dominions will say without a moment's hesitation that he is fighting for 'the Empire.' (3) 'Commonwealth' is already appropriated by the united states of Australia.

I

Many of us forget that England was the last to enter the race for Empire. Portugal, Spain, Holland and France were all before her and all failed. If we ever ask why we have succeeded where they failed, we are often content to think that England had better generals, better admirals, better ships and more resolute and courageous soldiers and sailors. No doubt there is a large measure of truth in this, but if this had been all, Great Britain too would have failed where they failed and as ignominiously. The truth of the matter seems to be this. During the Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries the people of Europe were being brought into contact with the rest of the human race. This meeting of higher and lower civilizations, of the more advanced with the more backward peoples, was fraught with the gravest possibilities; react upon one another they must; and that reaction must take one or other of two forms, either mutual injury or mutual benefit. The choice lay with the more advanced peoples of Europe; the rest of the world, being at the mercy of the stronger, had to accept whatever treatment was meted out to them. It was possible to look upon and to treat the weaker races either as so much material for the gratification and enrichment of the stronger, or as people who, for their very backwardness and weakness, ought to be protected and uplifted.

Those who first entered the race for Empire failed because they took the former course and reaped its deadly consequences; but Great Britain succeeded because she took the second alternative to the lasting advantage of her own people and that of the rest of the world.

It is perhaps worth while to set this out in greater detail. Every advance in civilization is a challenge to a greater measure of self-restraint and to a new morality. Some people scoff at the idea of a 'new' morality; are not the basic principles of morals always the same? Of what value is a morality which is subject to change? It is true that the real basic principles of morals whatever they are do not change, but it must not be forgotten that no principles

have any influence upon life unless they are applied to practical conduct and unless specific acts are classified as good or bad, according as they do or do not agree with these principles. As civilization advances, men become able to act towards each other in a number of new ways which before were impossible for lack of opportunity. These new acts could not be classified into right and wrong before there was any chance to practise them. Hence at each advance in national progress the individual is called upon to make a number of new moral choices with which he was never before confronted, he must learn to choose the new 'good' acts and reject the new 'wrong' acts. And this is what is meant by a 'new' morality.

Consider, for instance, the case of a community which has advanced from being purely agricultural to being mainly industrial. A capitalist class comes into existence who are in a position of great advantage. Employer and employed seldom or never see each other face to face; there is no personal touch and no personal sympathy; relations become abstract and mechanical. But the capitalists have the upper hand and they may, if they will, oppress, exploit and sweat the poor in a manner and to a degree which in the older days was impossible. Obviously any further progress on the part of such a community depends upon whether the richer classes learn to restrain themselves in the presence of these new opportunities and to have some consideration for the needs and lives of those who are less fortunate. In other words, every advance to a new stage of social life brings with it a challenge to a new morality, and success or failure depends upon the way in which that challenge is met. This same truth is illustrated in the life of every great nation at the present moment. The enormous accumulation of capital in the hands of a very few, not merely as owners but also as directors, means that they possess a power over the daily lives and fortunes of their fellow-men greater, perhaps, than was exercised by any Emperor of the past. Unless the community can produce from within itself a class of employers who are strong enough to regard themselves as stewards and servants,

not as irresponsible despots who may always push their own advantage to its extreme limit, that community is likely to fail by internal dissension.[1]

But let us go back now to the Fifteenth century. At this period a discovery of immense importance was made. Men learned how to navigate the ocean, to steer their course when out of sight of land, and to build ships in which they could live for months. In a comparatively short time the people of Europe were brought into contact with continents and nations the very existence of which had been as yet unknown. Quite early in the Fifteenth century the Portuguese began to venture out into the Atlantic Ocean westwards and southwards. In 1488 Diaz rounded the Cape of Good Hope and eleven years later Vasco da Gama made the first voyage to India. Such was the daring and enterprise of the Portuguese that the King of Portugal styled himself as early as the year 1500 by the high-sounding title of 'Lord of the conquest navigation and commerce of India, Ethiopia, Persia and Arabia.' Early in the Sixteenth century there were Portuguese settlements both on the east and west coasts of Africa, and the islands now known as Madagascar and Mauritius were discovered. The limits of the known world were pushed further and further back; Brazil in the West and China in the Far East appeared upon the horizon, and in 1522 the first voyage round the world was made by the Portuguese sailor Magellan. It is worthy of note in passing that no Englishman performed this feat until the voyage of Francis Drake in 1579.

Throughout the Sixteenth century the Portuguese held a practical monopoly of the trade with India and the East. Towards the end of the century the Dutch whose ships had hitherto carried much of the produce of the East from Portugal to the ports of Northern Europe were excluded from Lisbon and in consequence set out to find cargoes for themselves in the East. The Dutch East India Company came into existence in 1602 and factories were

[1] These are put forward as illustrations only. It is probable that of recent years trade unionists have been quite as much at fault.

soon established in India, Ceylon, Sumatra, the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea. A few years later on they founded Batavia in Java as the chief centre of their Eastern trade, discovered Australia, and planted a colony in what is now New York. If the Sixteenth century in the East belonged to Portugal, the Seventeenth belonged to Holland, the first maritime power of the day. Before long it drove the Portuguese from the Far East and even the English were prevented from trading farther to the East than the Indian peninsula. And yet by the middle of the Eighteenth century the day of the Dutch was over and the Dutch East India Company became bankrupt.

Both the Portuguese and the Dutch had their trading-posts and factories and even their large cities such as Goa and Batavia, but neither had attempted to found an Empire in the sense of controlling the political destinies of the natives. This was first attempted by the French who, like the Dutch, the English, the Danes, the Scotch, the Spaniards, the Austrians and the Swedes, had founded East India companies in the Seventeenth century. Dupleix, the French Governor of Pondicherry, obtained no little political power in India by supporting a rival chief in the Carnatic and again in the Deccan. The English, however, quickly did the same and at the battle of Plassey in 1757 Clive defeated Dupleix and political power in India passed into the hands of the British. From that day onwards the British dominions in the East have steadily increased. The Dutch settlements, with the exception of Java and Sumatra, fell into their hands, and one by one the native states in India came under their control.

In 1494 the Pope had undertaken to divide the unknown world between Spain and Portugal. All that lay to the east of a line drawn through the Atlantic from north to south was given to the King of Portugal; and all that lay to the west was assigned to Spain. Thus the Portuguese were strongest in the East and the activity of the Spaniards was confined chiefly to Mexico and South America. Hernan Cortes completed the conquest of Mexico in 1521. From Panama Pizarro advanced to subjugate Peru on the

west coast of South America, and from there the Spanish dominions were extended by 1580 to Chile on the south and Buenos Aires on the east coast. Thus a ring of Spanish influence was drawn around the vast territory of Brazil in which many colonists from Portugal were settling. When the crown of Portugal was united with that of Spain the King of Spain ruled, in name at least, over the whole country from Mexico to the Straits of Magellan. And yet the dominion of the Spaniards and Portuguese has passed away so completely that there are now no less than sixteen independent Republics between the United States and Cape Horn.

Such in brief outline is the story of how the people of Europe came into contact with the rest of the world and of how one nation after another inherited the seat of power in the New World with all its opportunities and all its possibilities for good or evil. What use did they make of it?

Of the Portuguese, the Dutch and the Spaniards, much the same tale is to be told. Their chief object was wealth and the means to carry on war against other states. No nation in Western Europe could afford to neglect the new source of power; the discovery of the new continents threatened to disturb the former balance of power; whoever ruled the New World was likely to dominate the Old as well. At all costs, the trade with the East and the mines in America must be made to pay and pay handsomely. The rights of the natives, and indeed not only their rights but their feelings and their lives, were as dust upon the balance. For the most part they were treated as slaves, as so much cattle to be exploited for the benefit of their European masters. No limits were set to the cruelty and the greed of the conquering people. Everywhere the natives were helpless in the grasp of enemies as ruthless and rapacious as they were powerful.[1]

[1] I am speaking in broad terms and taking the picture as a whole. A study in greater detail would shew some exceptions, as for instance the efforts of the Spanish Crown to protect the American natives by the New Laws of 1542.

The discovery of the new worlds put into the hands of these European peoples a power over others such as they had never known before. Never before had they had such a chance as this ; for never had they found such rich prizes in the possession of such feeble guardians.

Just as in the year 1914 there was literally no power in the world which could deliver the Belgian innocents from German cruelty, so in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries there was literally no power in the world which could stand between the civilized whites from Europe and their coloured victims ; that is to say, no physical force, no military or political power ; one thing alone could intervene—the conscience of the stronger. The times called loudly for self-restraint ; the very helplessness of the natives pleaded for protection. But all in vain. Neither public nor private conscience was strong enough to stand the strain ; the early traders and settlers from Europe gave free rein to their worst passions.

The consequence of this lack of self-restraint was as injurious to the oppressors as it was to the oppressed, and that in two ways. The European sailors and traders belonged to a higher civilization ; they might have taught the natives to respect and admire that civilization and to desire to become more intimately associated with it. But instead the natives learned to fear and hate the white men, so that when the Dutch drove out the Portuguese and again the English drove out the Dutch, the natives were not greatly concerned to save their former masters. Indeed, so selfish were each of the conquering nations in their endeavours to keep a monopoly of the trade for themselves, that others could get no share in it unless they fought for it. Thus profits were eaten up by the expense of military and political establishments and in course of time bankruptcy followed.

But in another direction the injury inflicted on the European nations was greater still. No people can give free rein to their selfish impulses without suffering deterioration of moral character. The huge fortunes rapidly acquired set a new standard of luxury and put a power

into the hands of their possessors which a lifetime of honest toil in Europe could never obtain. This misbegotten wealth served to corrupt both political and social life. Kings replenished their coffers by selling responsible posts to their favourites who then proceeded to make what they could out of the unfortunate natives ; the habits of self-indulgence and rapacity acquired abroad could not be easily curbed at home. There can be no doubt that Portugal, Spain and Holland were weakened and degraded by their contact with the lower civilizations : it may be regarded as certain that they could not have permanently retained their hold upon America and the East, even if the English had never learned to sail a ship.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the British were at first very much better than their neighbours. During the Eighteenth century, English trade and administration in the East were marked by some of the worst features which had disgraced the conduct of the Portuguese and Dutch. Macaulay speaks of the officials who went to India to make two or three hundred thousand pounds and then returned to England, to buy a seat in Parliament and settle down as legislators for Great Britain and Ireland. ' Jos Sedley ' is a well-known type of the Indian administrator who came home to taint the national life.

But the important thing to note is that an end was at length put to this condition of affairs. The British people did at length come to recognize their responsibilities towards the natives and to treat them not as means to the enrichment of British traders and governors but as ends in themselves to be protected and elevated for their own sakes. To Edmund Burke and his prosecution of Warren Hastings, in a trial which lasted no less than fourteen years, must this change be ascribed in so far as it can be ascribed to any one individual. Warren Hastings was perhaps the best and ablest administrator who had yet been sent out to India, but even his great services to his country did not save him from prosecution. In the end he was acquitted, but in the meanwhile a sound public opinion had grown up on the subject of Indian administration which would not

tolerate any exploitation of the natives for the sake of private or public gain. From that time forward, no one, however exalted he might be or however great his services, could hope to escape public condemnation if he abused his power and yielded to the temptations which beset the despotic governor in the East.

It is not too much to say that this is the greatest moral achievement of modern times. Let us recollect that just as there had been no naval or military power which could compel the Portuguese, the Spaniards, or the Dutch, to treat the natives with mercy and justice, so now again there was no power which was able to stay the rapacity and greed of British rulers and traders. In each case, the Europeans were masters of the situation, the natives were powerless before them; if deliverance from European greed and cruelty was to come, it could come from one source only, from the people of Europe themselves. Conscience, and a sense of mercy, justice, and humanity within the breasts of Europeans could alone curb and restrain their own natural impulses towards self-enrichment and indulgence. These motives were not entirely absent from the minds of the Spaniards, the Portuguese or the Dutch, but they never got the upper hand in such a way as to dictate the public policy. To the lasting glory of the British nation it remains not only that these dictates of humanity were obeyed, but also that it has produced from within itself a class of rulers and administrators with sufficient moral backbone to resist every temptation to private gain and to devote themselves wholly and unreservedly to the interests of those over whom they have been put in charge. It is not to the great viceroys and proconsuls alone that this result is due, it is rather to the thousands of less important officials, whose names we never know, but who have in thousands of places all over the world worthily upheld the best traditions of British government. Probably every one of these men would repudiate the idea that he was doing anything wonderful or exercising any special self-restraint in refusing to take advantage of the helplessness of his people. But this is just the point.

This great moral achievement is not the work of any special individuals, it is a characteristic of their class and of their nation. No reader of the Old Testament prophets with their calls to social justice and national right-doing will underestimate the importance of this fact.

To Great Britain belongs the credit of having established a just law between East and West, between the lower and the higher civilizations, so that contact between them is no longer mutually destructive but mutually advantageous. Recent atrocities in the Congo Free State, in Putumayo and in the outlying islands of the Southern Seas and the Arctic Ocean remind us that the danger of misconduct is by no means unreal; but happily such cases are rapidly becoming fewer and farther between; the power of the white man's law is now directed towards the protection and uplifting of the less fortunate races, and if the unscrupulous behaviour of private traders still debauches and degrades the native races in distant islands, this is only possible because they are beyond the reach of the arm of the law.

The British were the last to enter upon the quest for Empire, because they were the first to rise to the new morality which the situation demanded. Had they failed to do so, had they continued to treat the natives as other European nations did, the Empire would have slipped from their grasp and others would have succeeded them where they succeeded the Dutch and the Portuguese. The German anticipations of rebellion in India the very moment war was declared in Europe would certainly have come true, only it would have happened long ago. But as a matter of fact, where hatred and fear might well have been, we find devotion and sympathy. And the whole world is witness to the fact that the English have succeeded in teaching the subject races of their Empire not only to respect and admire British rule and British civilization, but also to cherish them as among the most valuable possessions of life. Were we not so used to this, it would strike us with astonishment. If the French and other European states are to-day following the same enlightened policy, it

is because they have learned from the British Empire that it is the secret of success in colonial administration.

It is then hardly possible to exaggerate the moral value of the British Empire. It has made the modern world possible by preventing the mutual destruction of East and West. It has saved the East from generations of oppression, cruelty and bloodshed: it has saved the West from the corruption of ill-begotten wealth and from the degradation of unrestrained self-seeking. The Empire is built upon the principle of national service, that it is the duty of the strong to help the weak, and of the advanced races to succour the backward. It is open to the cynical to say that this is a mere pretext to justify interference with and the conquest of native states; but when we see the devotion which the native races have shewn to the Empire, we can no longer doubt that British rule has been to them a blessing.

Nor can we doubt that this benevolent policy has reacted favourably upon the whole national life of the English people. It has strengthened the national character, purified political life and trained up a race of administrators which has no equal. Moreover, the very needs of the Empire, and the opportunities it offers, have placed before the public another and a nobler standard of life than that of the self-centred money-seeker; they have set before us the ideal of the self-less civil servant, who expends himself gladly for the public good.

II

So much for the relations between Great Britain and the coloured and more backward peoples of the Empire; it remains to say a few words about the great communities of English-speaking people, now commonly called the 'Dominions.' It was soon found by the early adventurers from Europe that only certain parts of the new worlds were fit for habitation by white people. South America, which fell to the Spanish and Portuguese, and North America and Australia, which fell to the British, with the southern end of Africa were alone fit to become 'white men's

countries.' In the early days settlers were few and far between and they were exposed to great danger not only from risings of the natives but also from the attacks of other European powers. If the mother-countries protected their colonies from both these dangers, it was not unreasonable that in return they should have special advantages from the trade and commerce of the daughter-countries. Hence the 'colonial system,' under which the mother-country reserved a monopoly or at least regulated the trade of its colonies in its own interests in return for protection and defence.

But as time went on and as the colonies increased in population and in wealth, the services rendered by the mother-countries declined in importance, while the advantages reaped from the monopoly of trade increased. The restrictions imposed upon the colonists proved more and more irksome and soon there was grave cause for friction and ill-feeling. The mother-country became an incubus upon its daughter, and the colonists felt that further progress was impossible unless they could shake themselves free from the burden. Not until 1807 was Brazil allowed by the Portuguese Crown to trade with the outside world except through the harbours of Portugal. The loss of the thirteen American colonies is a story familiar to us all. By the end of the first quarter of the Nineteenth century the whole of South America, smarting under a sense of injustice caused in part by such restrictions on trade and in part by misgovernment, had followed this example, and province by province declared its independence of Spain and Portugal.

After the American Revolution, British colonial enterprise made a fresh start in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The old mistakes were avoided. After so many recent defections, the 'ripe fruit' theory came into favour; when the colonies were ripe, it was believed, they would naturally declare their independence. And though this theory was firmly fixed in the minds of British statesmen, yet one finds a surprising generosity and consideration, on the part of Great Britain, for the welfare of her distant

settlements. While still rendering them the help and protection of the British Navy and British prestige, every restriction on the freedom of their trade was removed, and more than that, responsible government, with every power which they insisted on having, was granted to them. Since then a remarkable process of unification has been in progress. The four separate colonies of Eastern Canada were given responsible government in 1848. In 1867 they were, together with the colony of British Columbia on the Pacific Coast, united to form the Dominion of Canada. The new Parliament which thus came into existence at Ottawa has itself become a mother of Parliaments, three new provinces, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, with rights of local self-government, having been added by Acts of the Dominion Parliament to the original number. All the Australian colonies were granted the privilege of responsible self-government by 1860, and in 1900 they were united under a new Parliament to form the Commonwealth of Australia. Finally, the same process took place more recently in South Africa. Responsible self-government was set up in Cape Colony in 1872, and in 1910 the four South African colonies, while each retaining a measure of local self-government (as was also the case in Canada and Australia), joined together to form the Union of South Africa.

How can we account for the extraordinary outburst of loyalty, the really very great sacrifices which, to their own surprise as well as to that of the rest of the world, Canadians, Australians, New Zealanders and South Africans find themselves glad to make for the sake of the Empire? A hundred years ago the Spanish and Portuguese in America were hastening to repudiate all connexion with Spain and Portugal. A hundred years ago the English plantations in America had just declared their independence, and peace between America and England was but three years old. To-day we have seen what we have seen, and the contrast is astounding. How shall we account for it?

The foundation of all is undoubtedly to be found in a change of British policy. The same sense of justice and humanity which had prompted a new attitude towards the

more backward races was brought to bear upon the relations of Great Britain to her colonies. They too were no longer treated as means to the enrichment of British merchants, but as ends in themselves to be aided and protected and, as it were, started in life. The unlooked-for result has been a deep-rooted confidence in British statesmanship and in British justice. The Dominions have been extraordinarily willing to allow the control of their relations with other countries, so far as peace and war are concerned, to remain in the hands of the British Cabinet. Never has there been any suspicion or any misgiving that this power might be used for selfish or unworthy purposes.

Further, as the colonies developed into the Dominions, this confidence and affection have naturally deepened into the strongest kind of loyalty and devotion. The sense of nationality, it is true, is extraordinarily strong in the Dominions ; they feel they have entered into a fair inheritance, and that if they play their part worthily a great future lies before them. But this national sentiment is by no means in conflict with their loyalty to the British Crown ; quite on the contrary, it is the very ground and substance of that loyalty. To those who will see, the facts are plain. It is because of, and only because of, the common British connexion that a Canadian or an Australian nation has been possible. In 1867 there were, in what is now the Dominion of Canada, five separate colonies, each with its own government. Four were situated on the Atlantic Ocean and one on the Pacific, with a vast unknown wilderness lying in between. Had any one of them declared its independence or elected to throw in its lot with the United States, the Dominion of Canada would have been for ever impossible ; either it would not have had its own ports on both oceans, or else it would have been cut in two by a huge slice of American territory. Loyalty to the British Crown then was the one ground common to all on which they could unite and on which they did unite. The same thing is true of Australia and South Africa. No Canadian or Australian community has ever exercised any rights of self-government except as a loyal and dutiful part of His

Majesty's dominions; and no one has ever borne office or exercised jurisdiction except he has been empowered to do so by His Majesty the King. National sentiment therefore, and loyalty to the British Crown, are not two rival motives; they are in reality one and the same thing. For this reason the war is taken up like a Crusade. For good or evil, the Dominions are part and parcel of the British Empire; to make it otherwise they would have to violate their own history and deny their own identity.

The Germans of a German colony, had there been any of the same kind, would no doubt have been brought up to believe in 'Deutschland über Alles,' with the result that, in the hour of real danger, Deutschland would have stood last in their thoughts. But Canadians and Australians, having been encouraged to place Canada and Australia first, have come to put the Empire first, simply because the Canada or Australia to which they are attached is and always has been a Canada or Australia which forms an integral part of the Empire. They know no other and they want no other. If they are compelled to leave the British fold, it will be much against their will.

III

If the Empire has served a great purpose in the past, its preservation is likely to serve an even greater purpose in the future.

The assurance of continued peace is one of the difficult problems of the future. Can we make sure that nation shall no more go to war with nation? There is reason to hope that here too the British Empire may play a part of no little importance; not by becoming so big and strong that no one else will dare to oppose its will, but by reducing the area within which international strife is possible.

War is a conflict between States or organized communities, not between individuals. If all the world were of one State, war—except perhaps civil war—would be abolished. Germany, for instance, claims room for expansion. But all the suitable parts of the earth are in the

possession of Great Britain. Here is a conflict of interests out of which war may arise. But it is not the interests of individuals that conflict: the German citizen is as welcome and as free in the British colonies as any subject of Great Britain herself; but the interests of the two States conflict: for every time a German becomes a British subject, so much is taken away from the strength of the German State and so much added to the strength of the British State. Now, so long as the two States look upon themselves as rivals or possible antagonists, this conflict of interests is very serious and may easily lead to war. But suppose that the two States could somehow or other be united to form one and to think of themselves as one, all thought of war on these grounds would be abolished. Now this is precisely what has happened in the growth of the British Empire. By uniting many communities in one State, the possibility of a conflict of national interests is removed, and so war is not so much as thought of. For instance, a community of Roman Catholics of French descent was settled upon the banks of the St. Lawrence River. Farther up the river lay an English community of non-Roman Catholics. Here was every prospect and possibility of misunderstanding. The two races divided by language, religion and traditions, had lately been at war. There was no possibility of their coalescing by inter-marriage. So long as they remained two separate political entities, their proximity and the very fact that they needed each other was an occasion of conflict and disagreement. Ontario could not reach the ocean except through the portals of Quebec. Quebec could not expand except in the direction of Ontario. The Papineau Rebellion of 1837 indicates what might have happened. But fortunately each community owed a common allegiance to the British Crown, and in that common loyalty they have been able, while retaining each its own local self-government and its sense of continuity with its own past, to unite in a new government for the management in common of the affairs which are common to both. Thus every relation between the two communities, which might have become an occasion of war while these communities were separate

and rival political entities, becomes a bond of union when they are united under one common government. The result has been that a region which might have become the scene of battle between two neighbouring peoples is now withdrawn from the area within which war is possible, unless indeed it be invaded from abroad.

A glance at the condition of affairs in South America will shew a marked contrast. Here there were no such difficulties in the way of union as were presented by the co-existence of French and English in Canada. From the United States to Cape Horn one finds a population which is Roman Catholic in religion and Spanish in language, manners and traditions; and yet where Spain alone once held sway, there are now no less than sixteen independent republics. The common allegiance to the Spanish Crown has here acted as a divisive force; for as one province after another revolted from Spain, each as it declared its independence started on a career of its own, with its own separate identity. And when this had once happened, none of them cared to cut themselves loose from their own traditions by uniting with other States. The consequence is that, instead of the peace and security which have characterized the northern half of America, we frequently find a condition of mutual distrust and warfare, of insecurity and revolution.

Every extension of the limits of the Empire withdraws so much more of the world's population from the area within which international strife is possible. If this confederation were to be broken up, if it were to disintegrate into so many independent States, the possibilities of war would thereby be increased enormously; India, Africa and a thousand islands of the sea would at once become the prey of other European peoples who would struggle for their possession, and war between the great Dominions would no longer be impossible. It is not impossible, of course, that so powerful a combination may be used to coerce weaker States; but when this happens, the basic principle of national service on which the Empire is founded will have been changed and the whole thing will already

have within itself the seeds of its own decay. But there is every reason to hope and expect that its power will, as in the past, be used in the cause of truth and justice.

Not long ago a preacher was heard to say from the pulpit that after the present war we must address ourselves to three great tasks, the first being a means to the other two: the better organization of the British Empire, the reunion of Christendom, and the evangelization of the world. At first sight, the introduction of what is mainly a matter of political and national concern in such a context seemed questionable. But when we think of the moral value of the Empire as guaranteeing a just relationship between the weak and the strong, as practising the rule of national service and as an instrument of peace and goodwill; when we think of what confusion and trouble might, and almost certainly would, follow upon its collapse, we will do well to think twice before saying that the combination was simply a piece of national pride and arrogance.

IV

The dissolution of the Empire is unfortunately by no means an impossibility. Already there are clear indications that it has outgrown its present political organization and that, if it is to continue, some readjustment is necessary.

In order to see this clearly let us remind ourselves of some of the salient and relevant facts regarding the present condition of things. According to Mr. Curtis' statistics the Empire has a population of about 433,500,000. But of this enormous total only a little more than one-seventh, about 64,500,000, are self-governing, or rather one ought to say, are capable of self-government. One-seventh of the Empire therefore must supply the character and the statesmanship necessary to govern the whole. As a matter of fact, however, it is not this one-seventh which supplies the lack of governing capacity in the other six-sevenths, but a very much smaller proportion of the whole. Nineteen and a quarter millions of people, the population of the

Dominions, govern themselves indeed, but contribute nothing to the statesmanship which directs the rest of the Empire, and but very little to the cost of its defence. Upon the people of the United Kingdom, some 45,000,000 strong, a little more than a tenth of the whole, falls the entire burden of governing the six-sevenths and the responsibility for the defence and protection of the whole. These proportions are not fair. But the future is likely to see them even more unfair. It seems inevitable that, relatively to the rest of the Empire, the United Kingdom should decrease in population and in wealth. The 312,500,000 in India, for instance, will naturally multiply much more rapidly than the 45,000,000 of the United Kingdom. And when we contrast the population of the United States as it was one hundred years ago—rather less than half the present population of Canada—with what it is to-day, more than double that of the British Isles, we obtain some measure of the progress which may lie before the Dominions in the next hundred years. It is not likely that they will all grow as rapidly as the United States has grown, and perhaps it is not desirable that they should do so, but at least we must be prepared to find that they will gradually increase until in course of time they equal, and perhaps surpass, the United Kingdom in numbers, if not in wealth also.

With these facts in view, it seems highly desirable, if not wholly necessary, that the peoples of the Dominions, who have shewn themselves capable of governing, should be associated with the people of the United Kingdom in the immense responsibilities which they are now bearing alone. From the point of view of Great Britain herself, there can surely be no doubt about this. The burdens must become more and more onerous, and, in combination with the many internal and social problems which are troubling her, will in time become intolerable.

The cost of maintaining an adequate system of defence falls at present entirely upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of the United Kingdom. The Dominions spend certain sums upon naval and military preparations and they are anxious to do more, but no one knows what is the

measure of responsibility resting in peace-time upon each Dominion, nor is there any definite plan upon which all political parties can unite. Shall the Dominions give an annual contribution in money to the British Treasury without asking for any share in controlling the method of its expenditure? or shall they each maintain an army and a navy of their own? or shall they make special grants on special occasions? Until these and similar questions are settled, the hands of those who would be glad to give their fair share are tied.

In fact, from the point of view of the Dominions a change whereby they shall be able to share in the control of their relations with foreign countries is essential. It is impossible that the voters of the United Kingdom should permanently take upon themselves the responsibility of deciding whether millions of Australians, Canadians, New Zealanders, and South Africans are to engage in war or continue at peace with the other nations of the world. The public life of the Dominions is already suffering from the lack of these greater responsibilities. There are no large issues at stake; political life tends to degenerate into petty squabbles about essentially parochial affairs and people do not learn to think of what is going on in the world outside or of what attitude they ought to adopt towards these happenings. A capacity for taking responsibility which is not used soon degenerates into self-centredness.

Moreover, it is questionable whether the Dominions will any longer be content with their present relations to the United Kingdom. The present war has opened their eyes to things they did not see before. They have forwarded their battalions and have raised their taxes, but they have not had a word to say in the conduct of the war. They have no thought whatever of regretting their action, and they would undoubtedly do the same things over again. But they have come to realize that the Cabinet which has been conducting the war is also responsible for the internal affairs of the United Kingdom, and that the personnel of that Cabinet was determined more by the internal condition of the United Kingdom than by the need of winning

the war. No one is to blame for this; it was inevitable under our present political organization. When the European conflict came upon us, the people of Great Britain were on the verge of civil war; the deepest distrust, the bitterest enmity, existed between the Liberal-Labour-Nationalist combination on the one side and the Unionists on the other, and, roughly speaking, between the upper and the lower classes. Had a Unionist Government been in power at any time, the lower classes would have lost interest in the war and would probably have felt that in some way or other the struggle was being continued in the interests of the rich and to the injury of the labourer. Success in the war depended on national unity, and national unity could only be secured by maintaining a Cabinet which was mainly, if not wholly, Liberal. In spite of a series of colossal blunders, the same men were until quite recently kept in power who before the war understood so little of what was happening abroad that they publicly scoffed at the possibility of war and reduced the national preparations to the lowest level they could. Had it been possible in the early days of the war to select a Cabinet for war purposes only, its composition would have been different, and it would probably have been much more efficient. As has been said, no one is to blame for this: under the present system it was inevitable; at no time would it have been either possible or desirable to introduce statesmen from the Dominions into the Cabinet; but, like the United Kingdom, the Dominions have had to bear their share of the cost of maintaining in office a Ministry of the second-best. From the point of view of the Dominions then it is a matter of great importance that in future the conduct of the foreign affairs of the Empire should not be so closely united with the conduct of the internal affairs of the United Kingdom. And this would at once permit the entry of the Dominions to the highest councils of the Empire and relieve the Parliament at Westminster of the congestion of business and the multiplicity of diverse affairs which now hinders the progress of its deliberations.

But more than this. Under our present Imperial organi-

zation a situation may at any moment arise in which the Imperial Parliament and the Parliament of one of the Dominions may find themselves unable to agree on some question of vital importance to which an answer, as for instance in the case of a war, must be given at once. If the case did not permit of postponing the decision and if agreement were impossible, the people of the Dominion would find themselves obliged to choose between two courses, even though they might intensely dislike both: they would have to choose between a submission to the Parliament of the United Kingdom and a declaration of their independence. The possibility of such a situation is always with us under our present system; no one can say when it will arise; and when it does come, it will be too late then to begin to devise more efficient machinery of government, and the Empire will begin to break up.

And yet even after all this has been said, the difficulties and the risks involved in any change loom up so large and forbidding that one is inclined to ask whether, in view of the excellent results produced by our present system, it would not be better to let things remain as they are, and trust to the loyalty and good sense of the Dominions. But this is an exceedingly dangerous policy to pursue. No one who is in touch with feeling in Canada or Australia can doubt for a moment that the public in these Dominions is looking forward to a change in the administration of the Empire such as will allow them to have some share in the control of foreign affairs. They are quite prepared to allow several years to go by while the best thought and the acutest political sense we have are being brought to bear upon this very difficult problem. So long as things are moving in the right direction, there will be no impatience. But if at the end of the war they are met with a decided *non possumus*, there will undoubtedly be very great disappointment. It will mean to them that the Empire is too big to live; that British statesmanship of the past has brought into existence something bigger than the statesmanship of the present day can maintain; it will be to them a confession of impotency and of failure, and it will

be a warning that they must each begin to look out for themselves, for sooner or later the whole must break in pieces.

V

'The problem before us,' says Mr. Curtis in *The Problem of the Commonwealth*, 'is to see how British subjects in the Dominions may become equally responsible with those in the British Isles for the conduct of foreign affairs.' His own solution may be briefly stated thus. The Foreign Office, the Admiralty, the War Office, the India Office and the Colonial Office, all of which deal mainly with affairs concerning the whole Empire and cannot well be divorced from each other, should be separated from such offices as the Board of Trade, the Home Office, the Local Government Board, the Education Department, and the Board of Agriculture, which are almost exclusively engaged with the local affairs of the British Isles. Each of these groups should form a single Cabinet, one of which will be responsible to a Parliament elected by the voters of the United Kingdom and the other to a Parliament elected partly by the voters of the United Kingdom and partly by those of the Dominions. Each Cabinet must have a Finance Minister of its own, and each must have the power to collect taxes—the one from the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, the other from the taxpayers of the whole Empire. Thus there would be an Imperial Cabinet, responsible to an Imperial Parliament, elected by the voters of the Empire, and dealing with the affairs common to the whole Empire; and also another Cabinet, responsible to another Parliament, elected by the people of the United Kingdom, and dealing with the special affairs of the United Kingdom.

The number of schemes of Imperial Federation which have been put forth is comparatively large. The first thing to do in testing them is to see whether they are really workable. Now it is safe to say that no scheme can be worked which does not (1) allow to each of the component members of the Federation a full measure of autonomy in purely local affairs; there must be no interference by

English representatives in a Dominion Parliament, nor must there be any interference by the Dominions in the purely local affairs of Great Britain and Ireland. (2) Each Cabinet must be responsible to a single Parliament and a single electorate. No Cabinet can carry on the work of government if it is responsible to more than one Parliament; for sooner or later it will happen that the two Parliaments will disagree, and then the Cabinet cannot both remain in office at the bidding of one Parliament and resign at the bidding of the other. From this point of view Mr. Curtis' scheme is a workable plan. It gives to British subjects in the Dominions an equal share with those in the British Isles in the conduct of foreign affairs and in the cost of the common defence, and yet it preserves the local autonomy of each Dominion and provides that each Cabinet shall be responsible to a single Parliament and a single electorate. On the other hand every scheme to include colonial representatives in the present Parliament at Westminster means that either the United Kingdom surrenders its local autonomy, or else, if the delegates from overseas are to vote only on questions affecting the whole Empire, the same Cabinet is made responsible to what is in reality two Parliaments and two electorates, one including and the other excluding the Dominions. And this would sooner or later lead to an *impasse*. Every scheme for an Imperial Council with delegates from the Dominions will either be an unreality and the proposed Council will have no real control over the foreign policy of the Cabinet, or else the same Cabinet will again be made responsible to two different bodies, to the Imperial Council and to Parliament. The same practical difficulty lies in the way of every attempt to include statesmen chosen by the Parliaments or Cabinets of the Dominions in the British Cabinet; the same executive cannot be made responsible to two or more different Parliaments. Some people suggest a system of close alliance, but this is no solution at all. Alliances are based on treaties between sovereign States, who agree to combine for certain purposes. But if the Dominions are to assume the position of sovereign States, the Empire no longer remains a single

State. Mr. Curtis' scheme avoids these two pitfalls, and it is at least a workable engine of government.

There are very great difficulties to be overcome, it is true, and the whole movement must in any case be more or less of an experiment. There is the very difficult problem of taxation; in what proportions are the taxes to be assessed upon the Dominions? What sources of revenue, if any, shall be earmarked for Imperial purposes? How shall they be collected, and, above all, how can their payment be enforced? The new Imperial Parliament will not find it easy to borrow money unless it has the power to compel payment from its individual taxpayers all over the Empire. But if the Imperial Parliament has a jurisdiction concurrent with those of the Dominion Parliaments, friction may speedily arise. Then, there is the difficulty of the distances which must be traversed by the representatives from overseas. Finally, self-government in our system works through parties; but will it be possible to organize a definite party-system in an Imperial electorate scattered all over the globe? These, of course, are real difficulties; on the other hand, it has not yet been shewn either that they are insurmountable or that they will be any less real in any other scheme.

But the objection which will weigh most heavily against Mr. Curtis' plan in the minds of most people is that it involves such drastic changes: the sudden creation of a new Parliament and a written constitution, and the admission of so large a number of voters to a share in the control of the destinies of the Empire. The English constitution is based on a mass of precedents which have slowly accumulated during centuries; the plasticity and adaptability which are its chief advantages are due to the fact that it has never been embodied in a written document. It will indeed be exceedingly difficult for people in the United Kingdom to reconcile themselves to such sweeping changes or to persuade themselves of the wisdom of departing so widely from what they have always looked upon as the surest and best.

But once we get outside the British Isles we find that constitutional government in the Empire has everywhere

proceeded in the same direction, towards the creation of greater and more inclusive wholes. The Dominion of Canada in 1867, the Commonwealth of Australia in 1900, and the Union of South Africa in 1910 all tell the same tale. In each case the separated colonies realized that no one of them could advance further except they united together under a new Parliament with representatives elected by the voters of all the colonies. There is not the least doubt that in each case the union has been found to work well and has been greatly to the advantage of all concerned. No one of them would for a moment contemplate a return to their former state of disunion. What Mr. Curtis suggests is that this process of unification should be carried one step further, and that the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa should now unite under still another new Parliament charged with the conduct of the affairs which are common to all five countries, leaving each to regulate its own domestic affairs as heretofore.

The Dominions would undoubtedly accept a proposal such as that of Mr. Curtis much more readily than would the people of the United Kingdom. For the former no constitutional changes would be involved; there would only be more taxes to pay and one more set of elections to be held. But for the latter it would involve, as has been said, a tremendous upheaval, and one cannot but feel that they will do well to consider very carefully whether an easier way cannot be found. At the same time those who feel thus should return over and over again to Mr. Curtis' pages, where they will find the case for some drastic reorganization stated with great force. When this question comes up, as it undoubtedly will whenever peace is restored, the people of Great Britain will be called upon to make a decision of even more importance to themselves and to the world than that which faced them in the early days of August 1914.

It remains now to say a few words about *The Problem of the Commonwealth* and *The Commonwealth of Nations*. Whether one agrees with Mr. Curtis or not, it is impossible not to feel a great admiration for the work he has done.

Not only are the books, in style and temper, worthy of the great cause to which they are devoted, but there speak from their pages an openness of mind, a breadth of vision, a sobriety of judgement, and a determination to probe each question to the bottom which are not often found in combination with such evident enthusiasm and tenacity of purpose. Mr. Curtis has done a great work. For the first time the whole problem of the Empire is treated in a manner which brings it within the range of practical politics. *The Problem of the Commonwealth* in particular will undoubtedly form a starting-point from which further discussion may begin, and perhaps a goal also to which it will return again. Though Mr. Curtis alone is responsible for its conclusions, yet he has had many collaborators, and already the views he expresses have behind them the weight of a considerable body of educated opinion. Not in the great cities alone, but in many a small town throughout the Empire, the parson, the doctor, the banker, and the merchant have met together from time to time in the Round Table groups to study the problems with which this book deals. It is thus assured beforehand of a wide and sympathetic circle of readers whose experience and opinions have helped to shape its conclusions. It is not the manifesto of a party, and yet it is not the product of a single scholar working in the seclusion of his own study; but it is safe to say that no other treatment of the same problems can claim the support at once of so much expert advice and of so much educated opinion.

HAROLD HAMILTON.

ART. II.—THE HYMNS OF ST. AMBROSE.

1. *Inni Sinceri e Carmi di Sant' Ambrogio, vescovo di Milano.* Da LUIGI BIRAGHI. (Milano: Tipografia e Libreria Arcivescovile, Besozzi. 1862.)
2. *Aurelius Ambrosius der Vater des Kirchengesangs. Eine hymnologische Studie.* Von G. M. DREVES, S.J. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder. 1893.)

3. *Studia Ambsroiana.* Scripsit MAXIMILIAUNS IHM. (Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner, 1889.)

4. *Untersuchungen ueber die Echtheit der Hymnen des Ambrosius.* Von AUGUST STEIER. (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1903.)

5. *Sainte Agnès Vierge et Martyre.* Par FLORIAN JUBARU, S.J. (Paris: Dumoulin, 1907.)

ON the Palm Sunday of the year 386 A.D. the city of Milan, the capital of North Italy, a royal residence and a bishop's seat, was ablaze with civil strife. Ambrose and his Catholic adherents were being closely besieged in the Portian basilica by the Gothic troops of the young emperor Valentinian II. To explain clearly how such a state of things had come about we must go back into the history of the last few years.

For some while the dowager empress Justina had been bitterly jealous of the influence and authority wielded by Ambrose. He was a zealous Catholic, she a no less zealous Arian. Every means of thwarting him had she tried, but she had been beaten all along the line. The Court party was of course on her side, but the Milanese in general were devoted to their great bishop. In the year 385, in the name of her son a weakling of fifteen, she demanded the use of one or more of the city churches for the use of her sect. Ambrose made a characteristic answer: never would he give up a church of God for the service of the devil. Religious fervour was running high. Justina had once more to confess herself beaten and to relinquish the claim.

At the beginning of the next year she made a bolder move. On January 21 an edict was proclaimed to the effect that all, whether orthodox or not, should have an equal right to the use of the churches of Milan. Should anyone hinder this edict from being carried into effect, he was to be held guilty of rebellion and treason. Death was to be the penalty. Ambrose, against whom of course the measure was specially aimed, was undaunted and refused to obey the new order, and the Court party did not venture to enforce its stern provisions.

Their next step was to summon him to appear before a consistory, the arbiters in which were to be laymen, some of them chosen by him, the rest by the Court. Ambrose was not the man to relish pleading before a Court that was half heathen and half Arian, before civil officials, Gothic officers and ladies-in-waiting. He wrote a dignified letter of remonstrance to the young emperor:

'Who ever heard,' he said, 'of laymen sitting in judgement on their bishop in matters of the faith? When you are older,' he went on, 'you will be wiser. Now, although you are not yet even baptized, you are eager to act the judge. However, if it is for the good of the Church I will sacrifice myself. If I am regarded as the cause of the present strife I will go into banishment.'

This proposal of his was just what the Court party wanted. They knew well enough that an open attack on the beloved bishop would be a false step on their part. But, if only he could be persuaded to leave his post, his doing so would put a winning card into the hand of those who knew how to play it to the best advantage. 'See your brave bishop,' they would be able to say; 'he has deserted you, he cares for nothing but his own safety.' So they eagerly took Ambrose at his word and said 'Go when you like and where you like.' But the Catholics, clergy and layfolk alike, flocked to him and begged him not to forsake them at such a crisis. He saw himself how necessary his presence in Milan was. 'I will not go unless you force me,' was his final answer to the Court.

Then came the demand which was at the root of it all, the attempt which had been successfully resisted the year before. Lent was now passing away. Under cover of the January edict the new Portian basilica was to be handed over to Auxentius, the heretical bishop, for use on the following Easter. Justina was determined to gain this point, Ambrose was equally determined to avert what he considered to be such a sacrilege.

On Palm Sunday the crisis came to a head. There was a general impression among the Catholics that a plot

was in hatching for carrying off or doing away with Ambrose. They ran together into the Portian basilica—which they were not to leave for several days—an excited crowd, resolved at whatever cost to defend the sanctity of the church, ready if need should be to die with their bishop. There were great cloisters running round the building which would serve to afford them shelter for the time being. Justina however began by having these occupied by her troops, who Goths though they were did their work in a half-hearted spirit. The services inside the church were thus from time to time interrupted by the clang of arms and the braying of trumpets. Then it was that Ambrose preached to the eager congregation his indignant sermon against Auxentius, whom he regarded as the real author of all the trouble. This is the pith of it :

'I will sanction no violence in resisting, but the rights of the Church I will not give up. Much as I reverence the emperor : ready as I am to sacrifice my property and my life—the surrender of that which is God's is not mine to make. Naboth of old defended his vineyard with his blood : shall we then give up the church of Christ ? Wounds received for Him hurt not but rather bless. Let me be the victim if a victim there must be. I have no fears save on your behalf. As once in Samaria, so it is now : they that be with us are more than they that be with them.'

But it was not only with words such as these that Ambrose comforted their hearts and sustained their courage. Other resources also he had with which to wile away the weariness of the siege. On this occasion it was that certain customs long established in the Eastern Church were first introduced into the West : the customs of holding vigils and of singing psalms and hymns antiphonally.

Ambrose had already written some hymns for the liturgy of the Milanese Church, though we do not exactly know when.[1] The hymns in themselves were by this

[1] Some scholars think that Augustine's words quoted below do not bear out this assertion. They maintain that amid the storm and stress of the siege of the basilica Ambrose found time and

time no novelty. But in order to bring more life and spirit into the services a new mode of singing them was introduced. The whole of the vast congregation was as usual the choir. When the first verse of a hymn had been sung by the one side the second verse was taken up by the other side, and so on throughout the hymn.

It was the singing of the hymns in this novel manner that above all seized upon the imagination of the people. Their effect was extraordinary. The words, as noble as they were simple, setting forth in clear and definite terms those great truths for which they were even then suffering such discomfort and anxiety, thrilled them through and through. One who was in Milan during these stirring times has painted in memorable words the deep impression which the mighty volume of the sound of all those voices singing with one mouth and with one soul had upon those who were present. Augustine, the illustrious Doctor of the Church, the intimate friend and sometime disciple of Ambrose, tells the story thus.

'Not long had the church of Milan begun to use this kind of consolation and encouragement, the brethren zealously singing with voice and heart. I believe it was a year or not much more that Justina, mother of the emperor Valentinian, then a boy, was persecuting Thy servant Ambrose, in favour of her heresy, in which she had been entrapped by the Arians. The devout people were on guard in the church, ready to die with their bishop Thy servant. There my mother Thy hand-

leisure to write his hymns, no improvisations but carefully worked out poems. That he should have done so may not be absolutely impossible, but it is most improbable. Besides, the upholders of this interpretation are making Augustine say that *psalms were then sung for the first time in Milan*, which would be absurdly untrue. Then again Ambrose himself in the passage quoted a few lines below states that his opponents declared that the people had been tricked by his hymns. Surely this implies that they had been sung by the people for some time. Jubaru suggests that in A.D. 386 Ambrose may have added to the 7-stanza hymns a doxology, in order to bring the number of stanzas up to the usual eight. This would account for some of the hymns having and some not having a doxology.

maid, bearing a leading part of the anxiety and vigils, lived in prayer. I, as yet unwarmed by the heat of Thy Spirit, was nevertheless stirred up by the amazement and disquiet of the city. Then was started the custom of singing hymns and psalms after the manner of Eastern parts, that the people might not wax faint from the weariness of mourning: from that time to the present it has been kept up, many, nay almost all, Thy congregations throughout the rest of the world copying it.'[1]

The impression made upon the hearts of all was indeed profound; so profound that the Arians fixed upon Ambrose the charge of using the hymns as magic spells. He accepted the charge with pride. 'They allege,' he said, 'that the people are deceived with the magic spells of my hymns. I do not deny the fact. For what can be more powerful than a confession of the Trinity daily sung by the mouth of the whole people?'[2]

The stalwart defence of the faith thus made by Ambrose backed up by the sturdy people of Milan was entirely successful. The siege of the basilica was raised so soon as Justina saw that it was ineffectual. Not one of the city churches was given over to the Arians for their services.

These hymns, then—which are they and where shall we find them? Surely we are entitled to believe that hymns which had the striking effect that we know these to have had will have strongly marked features by which we may recognize them: to feel sure that hymns which thus found their way to the heart of the Milanese faithful cannot have been by them neglected, forgotten and lost. All this is the case. They had definite characteristics of substance and of form, and they were clung to with obstinate pertinacity against both emperor and popes. And yet, when we come to ask exactly which these precious hymns are in the midst of many others more or less like them that have been handed down to us in old hymnals, it has not been found easy to give a precise answer.

Their very excellence has put one great hindrance in the way of the search. In this case, as in all others, success

[1] Aug. *Confessions* IX vi 15. [2] *Sermon against Auxentius*, 34.

led to imitation. Almost at once writers arose who composed hymns, which they tried as best they could to make close copies of those of Ambrose.

Moreover Ambrose had made the metre that he used so completely his own that it soon came to be called the 'Ambrosian' metre, as Alcaeus and Sappho had given their names to their respective measures. And then any hymn composed in that metre was called an 'Ambrosian.' Thus Isidore of Seville at the beginning of the Seventh century of our era says 'Hymns are from his name called Ambrosians.' Indeed so completely were the two words, hymn and Ambrosian, identified in the course of time, that even the connexion of the one word with the Bishop of Milan was forgotten. For Hildemar in the Eighth century gives an alternative derivation of the term Ambrosian as accepted by some : 'there is a certain herb called ambrosia which the heathen used in honour of their gods, and thence is derived "Ambrosian," that is "divine."'

We find ourselves therefore face to face with the uncertainty and confusion caused by the fact that it is often impossible for us to tell with certainty what even such careful writers as Cassiodorius and the Venerable Bede exactly mean, when they call such and such a hymn an Ambrosian.

The next stumbling-block in our way is this. The hymns of Ambrose were one and all written for and inserted in the service-books of his own church of Milan. Now it is notorious that the several parts of a liturgy are not signed with their authors' names. The hymns therefore in the use of Milan would be anonymous. For a while this would cause no doubt or confusion. But when the writer was dead and when the generation that knew him had passed away, and when the hymns had been adopted into the uses of other churches, then confusion and doubt would most certainly arise, aggravated in this particular case by the imitation of other writers.

A confusion that was in evidence so early as the Sixth century was not likely to grow less as the years rolled away and as the critical sense became duller and yet more dull. So that we need feel no surprise when we find the hymn collectors of the Sixteenth century,—such as were Clichtoveus or Cassander or Gillot,—assigning to Ambrose at

their own sweet will any hymns which they believed to be ancient and which they did not wish to give to any other writer.

The first attempt that can at all be called scientific to sift out the corn from the chaff with the winnowing fan of critical judgement was made by a committee of the Benedictine monks of the congregation of St. Maur in Paris.[1] The hymns formed an appendix to their excellent edition of the collected works of Ambrose. No hymn was by them allowed to pass as genuine if it was not attested by some good writer who lived near enough to the close of the Fourth century to render his statement on the point worthy of credit in the editors' judgement. The Benedictine scholars themselves did not claim that their method was perfect, only that it was the best available in the circumstances. They did not deny that among the hymns omitted by them there might be some written by Ambrose.

The witnesses admitted as adequate were seven in number. They were Augustine of Hippo, Caelestine (Pope from 422 to 436 and a personal friend of Augustine), Faustus (Bishop of Riez, who died in 492), Cassiodorius (who died in 575), Ildefonsus, Bishop of Toledo (who died in 667), the Venerable Bede (who died in 735), and Hincmar of Reims (who died as late as 882). And the hymns thus attested were twelve in number. Cited by their respective beginning lines they were:

1. Aeterne rerum conditor.
2. Deus creator omnium.
3. Iam surgit hora tertia.
4. Veni redemptor gentium.
5. Inluminans altissimus.
6. Orabo mente Dominum.
7. Splendor paternae gloriae.
8. Aeterna Christi munera.
9. Somno refectis artubus.
10. Consors paterni luminis.
11. O lux beata Trinitas.
12. Fit porta Christi peruia.

[1] The editors of St. Ambrose were J. du Frische and N. le Nourry and the work appeared in two folio volumes at Paris 1686–1690.

Now a few minutes' thought should serve to convince us that, useful as this test of quotation by an early and careful writer may be when taken in combination with other tests, it is not good enough when taken alone. For, if we may put it in that way, the matter is more or less one of chance whether any particular hymn is or is not among the few, the very few, that are so quoted.

And it will be seen from what we have said above that the canon of the Benedictines is open to yet another serious objection. The evidence of such men as Augustine and Caelestine, and even perhaps that of Faustus, is as good as evidence can be and is not to be gainsaid. But the last few writers on the editors' list—Cassiodorius, and in especial Bede and Hincmar—are by no means equally trustworthy. How should they be? What reasons have we for expecting that men who (whatever might be their eminence and other qualifications) lived from two to four centuries after Ambrose, should be able to settle a question that had already before their time become so doubtful and involved? Later writers, and sometimes much later writers, may no doubt lend valuable aid in such a search by corroborating evidence already gained from other sources. But of and by themselves they cannot certainly prove anything.

As to Bede, for instance, apart from his lateness of date, we can seldom feel sure whether in calling a hymn an 'Ambrosian' he thereby means to say that it was one written by Ambrose, owing to the unfortunate ambiguity of this term about which we have already spoken. At times his words can scarcely be taken to mean this. Thus in one place he writes: *quo modo et ad instar iambici metri pulcherrime factus est hymnus ille praeclarus*: Rex aeterne Domine . . . *et alii Ambrosiani non pauci.* No one, who has at all carefully studied the hymns which we know Ambrose to have written, can imagine for one minute that Bede, with his accurate knowledge of metre and of the distinction between metrical hymns and those based on rhythm, regarded him as the writer of not a few hymns like this one, consisting as it does of sixty-four lines and in its prosody quite unlike the hymns of Ambrose.

The Benedictine canon is therefore when taken by itself insufficient. And yet well-nigh all modern writers on the subject before the last few years have followed it implicitly. We may adapt Bentley's well-known saying about Stephens: the judgement of the Benedictines stood as if an apostle had been their compositor. A quotation by an early writer has been the one test of authenticity allowed by such scholars as Ebert, Manitius, Huemer and others. Ihm, who has done such excellent work on Ambrose, winds up a brief account of the above mentioned twelve hymns with the significant words: 'I *neither wish* nor am able to say more about the hymns of Ambrose.'

But there is a better way. As long ago as 1862, Dr. Luigi Biraghi of the Ambrosian Library brought out an edition of *The Genuine Hymns of St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan,* with an illustrative commentary and an excellent introduction setting forth his methods in detail. But, strange to say, not one of the scholars just mentioned makes any use of this book, only one or two of them so much as mentioning his name. This looks bad for Biraghi. However we hope to be able to shew that he is in the right and that he proves his case. And of recent years the late Dr. G. M. Dreves, Fr. Clemens Blume, Dr. August Steier and others have successfully taken up the cudgels for him.

The Benedictines had laid down one canon and only one. Biraghi lays down no fewer than three. Firstly *a hymn must be in every respect worthy of Ambrose,* in subject-matter, literary style and prosody. Secondly, *it must have been continuously in the Ambrosian use,* as the use of Milan is called. Thirdly, if it happens to be *attested by some early and careful writer,* so much the better. This third test is (as it should be) chiefly used to confirm other evidence. For, as we have already seen, because a hymn does not happen to be quoted, it does not follow that on this account it is not one of the genuine hymns for which we are searching. We may well add a fourth canon, which is indeed a corollary of the first. Like some other writers Ambrose was given to repeating himself, often using well-nigh the same words. *A hymn therefore that contains characteristically Ambrosian*

thoughts and phrases is likely to have been written by Ambrose. Biraghi and Dreves, and especially Steier, turn this canon to excellent account in their investigations.

Let us begin by taking into consideration the second of these tests, which at least at the beginning of the search is as important as any, and we shall soon find that it puts us on the right track. For if the leading question to ask is: Where shall we be likely to find Ambrose's hymns? the answer is certainly, and one would have thought obviously: In the service-books of that church for which they were written and in which they were anonymously inserted;—not, except incidentally, in the writings of Augustine or any other author.

We know that this church of Milan in every age of its history, but more especially in its earlier days, has shewn itself intensely conservative in upholding the Ambrosian use. Charles the Great succeeded in ousting the offices of other churches in his wide domains, but in spite of his strenuous measures [1] he failed to persuade or compel the Milanese to give up theirs. Is it then likely, is it conceivable, that they should have neglected that which was almost universally regarded as one of the most important parts of their rite, the hymns? And such hymns! written at such a crisis by their great bishop! No indeed.

Then we have to look for our hymns in the old manuscripts—the hymnals, breviaries, manuals, antiphonaries and psalters—which have preserved for us the traditional use of the Ambrosian church. And we shall not search in vain. Biraghi, and after him Dreves, examined these manuscripts, some dozen or so in number, ranging in date from the Tenth to the Fourteenth or Fifteenth century.

The outcome of the investigation is a collection of some forty hymns. Out of this number our genuine hymns of Ambrose have to be picked, as for one reason or another the whole forty cannot be his. This we must do by the

[1] Vita Caroli (apud Bolland. 28 Jan.) 26 *Mediolanum profectus omnes libros Ambrosiano titulo sigillatos, quos uel dono uel pretio uel ui habere potuit, alios combussit, alios trans montes quasi in exilium misit.*

application of Biraghi's first canon. We have to find out the characteristics of matter, style and scansion to which a hymn of Ambrose may be expected to conform. With this end in view we will take the four hymns which we know on Augustine's authority to have been written by his master, regarding him for the time being, but only for so long, as the one unimpeachable witness of authenticity. These four we will look into pretty closely.

The four hymns in question are these : *Aeterne rerum conditor, Deus creator omnium, Iam surgit hora tertia, Intende qui regis Israel.*

To the hymn for early morning, *Aeterne rerum conditor,* Augustine alludes thus : ' Wherein I said in a certain passage concerning the apostle Peter, that the Church is founded on him as on a rock ; this being the sense of what is sung by the mouth of many in the verses of the most blessed Ambrose, where . . . he says : " At its note the very rock of the Church wept away his guilt " ' (*Hoc ipse petra ecclesiae | canente culpam diluit*).

The evening hymn, *Deus creator omnium,* Augustine quotes several times, twice naming Ambrose as its author. The most striking of these allusions is contained in a well-known passage of his *Confessions.* In A.D. 387 the saintly Monnica died and her son was overcome with grief. ' Then I slept and awoke and found my grief not a little assuaged, and as I lay alone in my bed I called to mind those truthful verses of Thy Ambrose : for Thou art " God the creator of all " ' (*Deus creator omnium*).

To the hymn for Terce, *Iam surgit hora tertia,* he alludes thus : ' This Spirit the bishop just mentioned also bids us obtain by prayer, when he says in the hymn : " and endeavours by earnest prayers to win the holy Spirit " ' (*uotisque praestat sedulis | Sanctum mereri Spiritum*).

To the Christmas hymn *Intende qui regis Israel* (which is usually known by the first line of its second stanza, *Veni redemptor gentium*) he refers twice. But as there is some doubt as to the authenticity of the one of these passages in which he mentions Ambrose's name, we will quote instead the words of Caelestine speaking at

the Council of Rome A.D. 430. 'I call to mind that Ambrose of blessed memory on the birthday of our Lord Jesus Christ made all the people sing with one voice : "Come, redeemer of the nations" (*Veni redemptor gentium*).'

These then are the four hymns. What helpful characteristics can we note in them?

To begin with, each one of them contains eight stanzas of four lines. If any one should ask why this exact number, we have an answer to hand which is at least plausible. A hymn of just so many verses would on the one hand not be so long as to weary the singers, nor on the other hand would it be so short as to preclude the dogmatic teaching, for which it was specially written. Then again, as we have seen, the hymn was to be sung antiphonally, and therefore it must needs contain an even number of verses. This mode of singing made it also desirable that as a rule the sense should end with each stanza and not overlap into the next.

In the next place we note that the four hymns were all written in the 'Ambrosian' metre, the *iambic dimeter* as it is called, a familiar example of which is given by Bishop Ken's 'Awake, my soul, and with the sun . . .' The laws of metre are carefully observed, almost as carefully as they had been observed by the great metrists Vergil, Horace and Martial.

Long before Ambrose's time a radical change in the principles of scansion had set in, one day to become almost universal. In the course of years there were fewer and fewer who were able to appreciate a measure based on the quantitative value of each syllable. And so the writers of verse that was meant to reach the masses at large naturally fell back upon the accent of each word as pronounced in ordinary conversation, this being obvious to the most uncultivated ear. To give one example. Commodian, the earliest Christian verse writer, any of whose writings have come down to us, lived about a hundred years before Ambrose and therefore so much nearer to the classical period. Yet he wrote so-called hexameters based upon

accent, of which it is not too much to say that they violated every metrical rule, such as these :

> 'Matronas uis esse, Christiana, ut saeculi duces :
> Auro te circumdas aut serica ueste, pudica,
> Terrorem legis ex auribus uento remittis,
> Res uanas adfectas, cuncta de Zabuli pompa,
> Ornaris ad speculum cincinnos fronte reflexos,
> Necnon et inducis malis medicamina falsa
> In oculis puris stibium peruerso decore,
> Seu crines tingis, ut sint toto tempore nigri.'[1]

But the prosody of Ambrose, based upon classical models, was as unlike this as it is possible for one thing to be unlike another.

Ebert would indeed bind Ambrose too fast when he says that his prosody is perfect. But we must remember that he was thinking only of the four hymns attested by Augustine. Suppose for example that out of all Vergil's works just one of his eclogues had survived. How erroneous in detail our ideas of his prosody might well have been !

To take one or two licences by way of example. Hiatus was as a rule avoided by the classical poets. Yet Horace could scan *capitī inhumato ;* Vergil *ter sunt conatī imponere Peliŏ Ossam,* and even *addam cerea prună ; honos erit huic quoque pomo.* Then we cannot complain if Ambrose wrote *Petrī adaequauit fidem* or *nē hostis inuidi dolo,* though for the matter of that the oldest MS containing the hymns has *nec* instead of *ne.* And as to the lengthening of short final syllables by the ictus or stress of the verse : of this we have two examples in the four hymns—*te diligat castūs amor,* and *qui credidit saluūs erit.* In this licence Ambrose goes no farther than Horace with *perrupīt Acheronta,* or Vergil with *pectoribūs inhians.*

Rhyme is another test. In the four hymns, the 128 lines of which give 64 pairs of endings, there are according to Manitius 11 cases. So that rhyme is neither sought nor avoided. Rhyme, be it remembered, is not unknown even in Vergil. Soon after the time of Ambrose it began to

[1] *Commod. Instructiones* II xviii 1f. (ed. Ludwig).

come into fashion and eventually it was used by all the later Latin poets. This was an inevitable result of the adoption of accent in the place of quantity, which we saw at work in Commodian. As the ear requires in poetry some means of knowing when each line is ended,—a knowledge no longer clearly afforded by the metre,—rhyme became desirable or even necessary.

Let us now inquire into the literary character of the four hymns, their outward form and style. They are, as we should expect from a man of Ambrose's character and education under the best masters of Rome, sharp-cut, clear, concise, nervous and strong. And as the themes are high, so the thought is profound. As Archbishop Trench happily put it :

> 'The great objects of faith in their simplest expression are felt by him so sufficient to stir all the deepest feelings of the heart, that any attempt to dress them up, to array them in moving language, were merely superfluous. The passion is there, but it is latent and represt, a fire burning inwardly, the glow of an austere enthusiasm, which reveals itself indeed, but not to every careless beholder. Nor do we fail presently to observe how truly these poems belonged to their time and to the circumstances under which they were produced—how suitably the faith which was in actual conflict with, and was just triumphing over, the powers of this world, found its utterance in hymns such as these, wherein is no softness, perhaps little tenderness ; but in place of these a rock-like firmness, the old Roman stoicism transmuted and glorified into that nobler Christian courage, which encountered and at length overcame the world.'[1]

One of the most strongly marked characteristics of Ambrose's (as indeed of ancient) hymns in general is that they are invariably objective and self-forgetful, whereas modern hymns are frequently subjective and self-conscious, not to say egoistical. In Ambrose's hymns 'man is elevated to God ; in the modern, God is too often depressed to man. In the former the soul of the worshipper blends itself with the souls of all other worshippers

[1] *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 88.

throughout the whole of Christendom in every age, and is absorbed in contemplation of God, and rises in harmonious concert and in a glorious unison of adoration and praise to "the God of the Spirits of all flesh,"—the Father of all, the Redeemer of all, the Sanctifier of all. In modern hymns the individual too often detaches and isolates himself from the body of the faithful; and in a spirit of sentimental selfishness obtrudes his own feelings concerning himself: .... and he does this in *public* worship, in the house of God, and makes his own individuality to be as it were the axis around which all the congregation, and even the heavenly sphere itself, is made to revolve!'[1]

The hymns which stand the tests that have been mentioned, that is to say, those which are in the liturgical books of the Milanese church and which bear the hall-mark of a workmanlike hand such as was that of Ambrose, are according to Biraghi eighteen in number. They are as follows:

1. Aeterne rerum conditor (at Cockcrow).
2. Splendor paternae gloriae (at Mattins).
3. Iam surgit hora tertia (at Terce).
4. Deus creator omnium (at the hour of lighting).
5. Intende qui regis Israel (at Christmas).
6. Amore Christi nobilis (St. John).
7. Inluminans altissimus (in the Epiphany).
8. Agnes beatae uirginis (St. Agnes).
9. Hic est dies uerus Dei (the Passion and Easter).
10. Victor, Nabor, Felix, pii (SS. Victor, Nabor and Felix).
11. Grates tibi Jesu nouas (SS. Protasius and Gervasius).
12. Apostolorum passio (SS. Peter and Paul).
13. Apostolorum supparem (St. Laurence).
14. Aeterna Christi munera (Common of Martyrs).
15. Nunc sancte nobis Spiritus (at Terce).
16. Rector potens, uerax Deus (at Sext).
17. Rerum Deus tenax uigor (at None).
18. Iesu, corona uirginum (hymn of Virginity).

[1] Wordsworth, *The Holy Year*, p. xxiii.

As to the first fourteen of these we may follow Biraghi without hesitation and admit his claim that they were written by Ambrose. But while the evidence with regard to the last four hymns is no doubt weighty, it is not convincing in the same measure.

We will first take the case of the three short hymns, 15, 16 and 17, each consisting of two stanzas. In their favour are the points that they are contained in most of the Ambrosian manuscripts, that in thought and expression they are not unworthy of Ambrose, and that they may be illustrated to some extent at least from his prose writings. Against their authenticity however the following objections must be taken into account.

Ambrose undoubtedly wrote another hymn for the Third Hour, number 3 in the above list. But the longer hymn may possibly have been written for use on Sundays and festivals, a shorter one for daily use. And there may have been another reason why he should write a second hymn for the Third Hour. In the longer hymn there is but a bare allusion to the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost: he may have felt that the subject was too great to be brought in as merely part of a hymn, and so may have separated for special treatment the two events with which the third hour was especially connected.

Their shortness renders the Ambrosian authorship of the three hymns doubtful. It is this above all that persuades Steier to assign them to some other unknown writer. He argues that, as the undoubted hymns of Ambrose without exception contain *eight* verses each of four lines, we may confidently expect this number in any hymn of his. But this seems to be too definite a statement considering our limited knowledge of the circumstances.

They are not included in the Rule either of Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, compiled A.D. 534, or of his successor Aurelian, compiled about A.D. 550, nor are they to be found in the manuscripts which contain the older series of hymns, although all the hymns known to be written by Ambrose, except the six composed in honour of individual saints, are forthcoming in one or more of these documents.

Moreover Steier objects that the agreement in respect of language between these three hymns and Ambrose's prose writings is very slight. With regard to this we must bear in mind the obvious truth that the shorter the hymn, the less chance is there of our coming across such parallels, which after all are by no means entirely wanting. It will be seen from what has been said above that the quotation by Hincmar of hymn 16 as Ambrose's carries little weight.[1]

It is perhaps safest in the present state of our knowledge to leave the question undecided. If the three hymns in question were not written by Ambrose they are for all that worthy of him.

For the last hymn on the list Biraghi confidently claims Ambrose as its writer, but his main argument rests on doubly insecure grounds. In the treatise *Concerning the Fall of a consecrated Virgin*, which is sometimes assigned to Ambrose and which is a severe rebuke of one Susanna who had broken her vows of chastity, we read *frustra hymnum uirginitatis exposui*. But probably Ambrose did not write the book, and even if he did the words cannot allude to our hymn, for *exposui* must mean 'I have set forth' or 'explained,' not 'I have composed.'[2]

However this does not prove that the hymn was not written by Ambrose. It is likely enough that he should have composed such a hymn for the virgins of whom he wrote and thought so much. His characteristic ideas and phrases occur in it, including the *slightly altered* quotation of scripture, which was quite in his manner. The number of stanzas, four instead of the usual eight, is a difficulty but not an insuperable one. We are inclined therefore to say that in all probability Ambrose was the writer of hymn 18. It must be mentioned that it is not in honour of one or more virgins, in which case a later

[1] It is given by some to Niceta of Remesiana, the possible writer of the Te Deum; *cf.* Ihm, *Studia Ambrosiana*, 73 f., Burn, *Niceta*, cxxxi f.

[2] The Benedictine editors of Ambrose identify the 'hymn of virginity' with the latter part of Psalm xliv (xlv), namely from verse 10 to the end.

writer would have had to be found for it, but a beautiful prayer to Christ the heavenly bridegroom.

The hymns of Ambrose were a new departure and their importance in the development of European literature can scarcely be exaggerated. Not only were they the model after which all following Christian hymns were written, but the masterly combination of the old external form and of the deepest religious feeling justifies us in dating the birth of modern poetry from the time of their composition. The ancient metre is indeed adopted, but it is the poet's servant and never his master.

A. S. WALPOLE.

ART. III.—THE CHURCH AND UNITY

1. *The First Principles of the Church.* By the Rev. C. A. BARRY. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1913.)
2. *Unity and Holiness.* By the Rev. CYRIL BICKERSTETH, C.R. (London: A. R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd. 1914.)
3. *Catholic Truth and Unity.* By the Rev. GERARD SAMPSON, C.R. (London: A. R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd. 1914.)
4. *The Church and Religious Unity.* By the Rev. HERBERT KELLY, S.S.M. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1913.)
5. *A New Rome.* By the Rev. RICHARD DE BARY. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1911.)
6. *The People of God.* By the Rev. H. F. HAMILTON, D.D., Formerly Professor of Pastoral Theology in the University of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Canada. (Oxford University Press. 1912.)
7. *Belief and Practice.* By WILL SPENS, Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1915.)

ANYONE who writes about the Unity of the Church writes about an ideal, and not a fact. Even the most Catholic-

minded of our apologists is bound to admit that the Church, if it be more than the Roman Church, is divided into at least three branches. And they are not such branches as Christ had in mind when He spoke the allegory of the Vine. That was an allegory of the union subsisting between Christ and His disciples, and derivatively between those disciples themselves; whereas the Branch-theory of the Church was invented to explain, if not to palliate, its disunion. It is not a theory which has ever claimed attention outside the pages of Anglican theology. Its failure, like the failure of all partial theories, has been to bring us to a franker, more open-eyed, and less *a priori* survey of the facts. The conclusion is forced upon us that the pieces into which the Church is divided are far more numerous than we had supposed. If the Roman Church is the only true Church and alone has any claim on men's spiritual allegiance, the matter is closed. But, if not, and if the Branch-theory be admitted to be inadequate, we have to confess that the Unity of the Church is nowhere to be found in actual life, and that all we have is approximations to it, which vary in truth and nearness to the archetype, but are none of them able to claim the monopoly of its representation.

I

At the end of the last century ecclesiastical discussion had drifted into a dilemma. Treating the problem as principally an historical one, theologians had devoted themselves with ever sharper instruments of research to establishing or to disproving the evidences of Apostolic Succession. The first Tractarians could and did develop the significance of the Succession as a doctrine in the whole scheme of Catholic belief, precisely because there was no great dispute about it as a fact: and when Arnold attacked them, it was not because they stated the fact, but because they made it important. But the progress of criticism in the Nineteenth century almost imperceptibly shifted the ground; and the *Lux Mundi* school—the present Bishop of Oxford in *The Church and the Ministry*, and in lesser degree Dr. Moberly in

his *Ministerial Priesthood*—had to occupy themselves with making good the fact in face of historical critics such as Professor Harnack and Dr. Hatch. The result was an *impasse.* On the one hand, the gap in the evidence between the records of Apostolic times and those of the Second century was emphasized by Protestant scholars, and could not, owing to the paucity of documents, be gainsaid ; while, on the other, no answer was forthcoming to the argument that, if the rule of Episcopal Succession were an innovation in the Second century, it is inconceivable that it should have been introduced without controversy or even comment.

The objection to such a situation does not arise principally from the unlikelihood of any further relevant documents or inscriptions being unearthed by the spade ; but rather from a growing reluctance to admit that any great doctrine or institution of the Church should be thought to rest upon the results of historical research. A similar reluctance in a kindred field of study played a large part in one of the most striking theological reactions of recent times, though in a different way. Modernists such as Le Roy and Tyrrell were prepared, rather than let Catholic dogma rest on foundations which historical criticism might undermine, to jettison the historical element in that dogma, and to uphold it still as symbolically or pragmatically true —as true for the spiritual life, even if not in concrete fact of the past ; true for faith, if not for knowledge. Anglican theologians as a whole have distrusted this reaction. Historical criticism does not involve, and indeed should be the surest antidote against, historical scepticism, which was what the Modernists would allow ; and what has been sought among us is a broader interpretation of the facts which all admit rather than a severance of doctrine from history while the latter goes by default. This method has been applied very fruitfully to the question of unity and continuity in the Church, and some of its findings are worth careful consideration.

A growing element in modern Anglican books on the Church has been the emphasis upon worship. Alike practically, historically, and doctrinally, the Eucharist has more

and more emerged as the centre of unity in the Christian Church. Father Kelly, whose stimulating book, *The Church and Religious Unity*, was written with the object of clearing up the concrete issues of the contemporary ecclesiastical situation, as much for himself as for his Nonconformist friends, lays it down that the Church 'is primarily an organization *for* worship, and it is the nature of this supreme act which must determine our ideas of organization.' These words might be fairly superscribed as motto over another theological work from a very different pen. In the second volume of *The People of God*, Dr. Hamilton subjects Christian origins—or rather the origins of the Church from Pentecost to the time of Clement and Ignatius—to a searching and scholarly analysis. The question which he asks is not 'How far can we trace back the threefold Ministry into Apostolic times?' but 'What were the conditions in the Primitive Church which must have led to the differentiation of organs of ministry within the Body?' And he finds the answer in the need of a President at the Eucharist. Preaching and teaching were both functions for which special talents were required, and no official commission could impart these; while neither the administration of justice nor the handling of funds seems to provide an adequate cause for the appointment of Presbyters. Dr. Hamilton omits perhaps one function which St. Paul's Epistles attest—that of correspondence on behalf of the local 'churches.' The information which reached him from Corinth, for example, must have come from someone whom both he and they could trust. But this necessity only serves to strengthen the main contention; for there was no one so well entitled to write to St. Paul about those whose conduct caused division in the Church as the man who was charged with the presidency at the Holy Communion. The function of celebrating the Eucharist and that of appealing to Apostolic authority for help and guidance in composing trouble both required official appointment, and would both be best done by one and the same person.

Dr. Hamilton discusses at some length the difficulty which has been felt owing to St. Ignatius' silence as to the

Apostolic appointment of bishops and presbyters, on which St. Clement of Rome insists. St. Clement's words are well known :

' And our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop's office. For this cause, therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons, and afterwards they provided a continuance (*or*, gave a further injunction) that, if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministration. Those, therefore, who were appointed by them, or afterward by other men of repute with the consent of the whole Church, and have ministered unblameably to the flock of Christ . . . these men we consider to be unjustly thrust out from their ministration. For it will be no light sin for us, if we thrust out those who have offered the gifts of the bishop's office unblameably and holily.' [1]

On a point of detail I venture to disagree here with Dr. Hamilton. The mention of ' other men of repute ' [2] looks to me like an afterthought inserted by the writer, not because it helped his argument, but because it enabled him to forestall possible objection by the Corinthians. The passage would be far stronger, for St. Clement's purpose, without that phrase : but, as I read it, the facts were too strong for him, and it was open to the Corinthians to point to exceptions—*i.e.* to Presbyters, who had not been appointed by Apostles. St. Clement, in true statesmanlike fashion, grants the fact, but points out that their appointment came from men of repute, and had the sanction of the whole Church. In a mechanical sense, it was not Apostolic ; but practically it was, as it had their sanction. This is a point of view which we shall return to directly in connexion with modern writings. Meanwhile, we may notice how the very allusiveness of St. Clement's phrase, its lightness of touch, strengthens the impression that a sense of Church order and continuity was already an ingredient in the Church-consciousness of those days.

The silence of St. Ignatius as to Apostolic appointment is patient of simple explanation. St. Clement was writing

[1] *Ep. Clem.* c. xliv.

[2] ἕτεροι ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες.

to the Corinthian Church as a statesman dealing with a particular practical point, which had been referred to him; and he reinforces his decision by an appeal to common ground in recent history. But St. Ignatius is writing rather as a saint and Father in God to his flock, covering the whole field of religious life and interest; and it is natural that he should give charge concerning the central act of Christian worship. He thinks liturgically and devotionally.[1] At the same time his Letters are important testimony to the functioning of another organ in the Body above that of the presbyters. 'Let that be counted a valid Eucharist which is under the bishop, or one to whom he shall have committed it.' The bishop's office appears, not only in connexion with the Eucharist, but as sacramental of validity (if one may use the phrase) at that Service. It is difficult to suppose that St. Ignatius would have written these words, unless there were some questioning in the churches of Asia Minor as to the 'validity' of certain acts. We are apt to speak as though the idea of validity were a comparatively modern innovation, erected as a stumbling-block between the Church and Nonconformity. In point of fact, it plays a large part in the Primitive Church—a part which deserves further attention from scholars. The martyrdom of St. Stephen first made it prominent through the dispersion of the Christians from Jerusalem. Conversions and baptisms occurred in Samaria; whereupon the Apostles 'sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: (for as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus).' A similar mission was entrusted a little later to St. Barnabas, who was sent to Antioch so soon as the Apostles heard of the conversion of 'the Grecians' in that city; and he lost no time in fetching St. Paul from Tarsus for the instruction of the converts. The object of these visits is clear: it is so to mortice the new stones into the growing building that its unity shall be preserved. In both cases the danger of independent life was urgent and real. In Samaria, the converts would have

[1] *Cf.* Ignatius, *Ad Smyrn.* viii, *ad Magn.* vi, xiii, *ad Trall.* iii.

every temptation to cut loose from the body whose headquarters were in Jerusalem : at Antioch, the converts were Gentiles,[1] whose acceptance of Christianity was bound to raise acute problems. The first need was to ensure the validity of their position—that is, to incorporate them in the Church under the sanction of the highest authority. The Apostles were determined that every group of Christians should, to use a modern phrase, ' qualify for universality.' The essence of validity in the early Church—whether of individual status, or of an act of worship, or of official function—lay in this element of recognition by the Church at large. Profound as was the respect paid to the abnormal charismatic workings of the Spirit, these were never suffered to be a substitute for that supreme gift of the Spirit which accompanied the assertion of Catholic fellowship. Christian life might come to birth in detached groups or isolated places ; but it was not felt to be complete until unified with the larger life of the New Israel. The Acts of the Apostles bears witness to this instinct in regard to Baptism and Conversion ; St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians and the Ignatian Letters attest it in regard to the Eucharist, both revealing a background where the question was whether the Eucharist was to be a local love-feast or the localized expression of a Heavenly Worship that was essentially One ; and St. Clement's Epistle bears witness to the attention given by the Apostles to the establishment of some permanent method of validification for the Ministry. Throughout the First century and a half the higher authority of the Church has charged itself with the duty of seeing that each community of Christians, as it develops, possesses qualifications which entitle it to combine or treat on equal terms with every other community [2] ; and it is in the course of this

[1] I accept the reading Ἕλληνας as alone making sense.

[2] I am indebted in this part of the article to Mr. Richard De Bary's *A New Rome*, which develops the idea of ' qualification for universality ' in relation to the ecclesiastical divisions of to-day. The book suffers from being too much the chronicle of an individual's spiritual progress towards a non-Roman Catholic position ; but it abounds in original and suggestive observations, and shews a

process of integration, and in response to its requirements, that we see arise the germs of such characteristic features of Catholicism as Confirmation, Liturgical Worship, and Apostolic Succession.

II

The foregoing analysis renders it inevitable, if it holds good, that we should ascribe vital importance to the function of government in the Early Church; and Dr. Hamilton's assertion that 'Government, both legislative and executive, there must be in the Church; but this is, though necessary, yet only a secondary function of the Church's life,' seems hardly to square with the organic development which he himself so masterly-wise portrays. The daily needs of the religious communities would of themselves lead to differentiation of function, especially in connexion with the Christian Sacrifice; but the ordering and correlation and subordination of the organs so evolved called for the constant exercise of judgement by recognized authority; and that, in effect, is government. Dr. Hamilton, moreover, has himself hit upon a most illuminating analogy between secular and ecclesiastical society, when he brings out the necessity of organization, if our Lord's command of mutual service [1] is to be fulfilled. For modern industry provides a most exact parallel. Political Economy is more and more tending to recommend better industrial organization as a remedy for our social maladies. In large part these evils are due to selfishness; but so far as they are removeable by human agency, the trend of opinion is all towards the big well-articulated business, which enables the best gifts to be used to the best advantage, gives scope to special ability, and encourages specialized pursuits. The social value of such a process will depend on its success in creating or discovering

deep devotion to the cause of Christian unity. Mr. De Bary's proposals are in many ways similar to those which were canvassed not many years ago in Australia, with a view to reunion between the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches in that country.

[1] St. Luke xxii 26, 27.

real opportunities of service, and in liberating the latent energy to take them. The events of the last two years have shewn how organization on an immense scale can be effected, if a common purpose is vividly enough presented to, and shared by, all; and already our social distemper is eased. Is not the same process feasible in things spiritual? The situation will be created in so far as the call to Unity in the Church is made powerful and compelling; and in that sphere, as in industry, men of governing talent will be needed to adjust connexions and correlate services. But the same was true in Apostolic days. Every increase of the Church, every step in the expansion of the kingdom, raised delicate problems which could not be disregarded; and, if the sacramental unity of the Body was to be preserved, wise and progressive government was a *sine qua non*.

The nature of Church Government is one of many questions which receive able and searching analysis in Mr. Spens' *Belief and Practice*. Like Dr. Hamilton's *The People of God*, that book takes rank with the best products of Anglican thought of the last thirty years; and no part of it is more effective than the chapters on Institutional Religion. After pointing out the refusal of civilized opinion to allow any form of political government an absolute value and authority, Mr. Spens draws out the distinction between a government which expresses, and a government which only recognizes, but does not express, the supremacy of the Crown; and he continues:

'Now the functions of a government include the expression of the principles on which the state exists; its activities are not more important in their practical effect, than is the influence of its claims and nature. That is why on democratic principles no particular government can be allowed to claim an essential character; and it is a strong reason in favour of the view that even the most benevolent of despotisms is inconsistent with such principles. On the other hand, if an absolute inherent sovereignty did exist, it is also implied that this should find some such expression as is secured in a superimposed government, or in one which has a direct sanction from the Crown and regards this as essential. Without such a character the government is at

least as inadequate as is, in other conditions, a benevolent despotism. It scarcely needs reiteration that the whole conception of an absolute personal sovereignty is inapplicable in any secular state or to any secular government. If, however, the kingdom of Heaven is to find expression, it follows that its government must partake of this character: that it must express not merely our allegiance to God, but a claim on this allegiance. Such a view finds satisfaction in the Church if, but only if, the government of the Church has a direct and divine sanction; if, but only if, it was in some real sense definitely established by our Lord. Otherwise a Christian society represents an aspiration after the Kingdom; it is not an expression of the Kingdom.' [1]

Such an exposition of the nature of government in the Church carries with it an important corollary: the gap in the evidence for Apostolic Succession in the sub-Apostolic period becomes of less moment than the clear indications, which we have from the records on both sides of the gap, that continuity of sanction was preserved. We may quote Mr. Spens again:

'The crucial question is as to the effect of this transition [from Apostolic authority to that which succeeded it]. I wish to urge that such a doubtful answer as sub-Apostolic history can provide is less important than is sometimes supposed. Put the matter in its most extreme form. Suppose the ministry which thus arose was not only on a basis which was largely congregational in form, but that it was purely congregational; it would still have a significance which goes beyond that which is inherent in such a ministry—a significance possessed in virtue of its continuity with, and sanction from, the Apostolic government. I have urged that it is essential, for any realization of the kingdom, that the ministry should be in some sense superimposed; but such a sense is obviously fulfilled, if you are dealing with a ministry, set up or approved by the original ministry, and in that sense simply a development of the original government as such. And because what is essential is that there should be a real continuity between the government at any instant, and the original government (a continuity dependent on a continuous sanction), it follows that when the government we have supposed had changed into the threefold ministry, without breach of

[1] *Belief and Practice*, pp. 210, 211.

continuity or consent, the latter in turn assumed that significance. Subsequently, any violent change, even the restoration of an earlier form of government, would fail to preserve the continuity which gives the significance in question. Any resulting government would have lost a characteristic feature, and an essential feature of the Christian ministry.' [1]

This interpretation of Apostolic Succession is not merely an alternative means of escape from the *impasse* which led the Modernists to allow historical scepticism. It bears striking positive fruits. It has often been observed that nothing would do so much to revivify English religion as the strong exercise of spiritual authority by those who possessed it ; and we have sometimes had to lament that our rulers in God seemed to doubt how far they really had the authority to exercise. The liberal view of the Succession does much to dispel misgivings on that score. For it requires us to believe that, at a crucial moment in the history of the New Israel, decisions infinitely pregnant of consequence were left to human judgement helped by the guiding Spirit. Our Lord's establishment of the Church did not annul man's freedom, but gave it the highest and hardest of all fields for its employment ; and we may ask whether He has ever withdrawn or limited the province in which it is needed. The point arises in regard to such Nonconformist bodies as desire, or may desire, reunion with the Church. If the sanction of the highest authorities in the Church, unmediated by the sacramental imposition of hands, was then sufficient, as a measure of transition, for the incorporation of independent bodies in the Church, can we deny that it may be so again ? If other graver obstacles were removed, it might well seem unnecessary to insist on Re-ordination. True, such Nonconformists as now desire to minister in the Church, seem to find little difficulty in this requirement. But one must remember that they approach the Mother Church as individuals. The case of a whole Christian body, now separated, desiring incorporation would be different. Their ministers might not 'qualify for universality' in the minds of many Church people ;

[1] *Belief and Practice*, pp. 214, 215.

but they would certainly have a wide basis of recognition for their title ; and statesmanship and charity would seem to point along the same road.

III

The ' graver obstacles ' are not far to seek on both sides. ' The humility of Christians must be for themselves and for the condition of the Christian Church, not for its nature.' Humility can only come from the overwhelming conviction of God's impartial love to all men ; and it is with that spirit of impartiality that we must look at our divided Christendom. The Jews in their dealings with our Lord, and the Judaizers in their dealings with St. Paul, are a proof, if our own experience is not vivid enough, of how a position of privilege tends to engender pride. Our great ancestry and spiritual traditions, our present wealth, our recognized primacy in the Anglo-Saxon world are messengers of the warning ' How hardly shall they that are rich enter the Kingdom of God.' The first charge on us, then, is a deliberate spiritual effort of abstraction from the ecclesiastical and political controversies which divide Christian bodies at this time. The truth, which we inherited at our Baptism, of the equal standing of all men before God, of their equal claims on His love and care, must be extended from individuals to societies. He loves alike all societies that seek to do Him service—all nations, all cities, all unions and associations, all denominations, all sects. And, if we approach the subject in this way, we shall realize that we say little to the point, when we say that a sect is in sin, because it is in schism. Our Lord taught us that God loves good and bad alike, sinners and saints ; and we dare not curtail the largeness of His love towards societies of men. What the surrender of any sect or society to God's Love may mean for them, we do not know ; those who maintain that it will mean for this sect or for that absorption in a larger and more Catholic body may be right. But it is not the first thing we should say. We Churchmen and Catholics have not yet risen to a height of spiritual understanding which

would justify us in saying anything more than 'Lord, be merciful to us sinners.' Have we indeed risen so far? Yet it is that humility beneath the just and impartial sovereignty of God which must become the principal feature of every denomination, as a denomination, before we can hope to reunite. 'Oh, wretched men that we are, who shall deliver us from this body of death?' That was the cry wrung from St. Paul by his divided experience. Our experience too is divided, the experience of division—or at least it should be, if we really believe in Unity, if Catholicism has real hold of our hearts. We are severed from our brothers in respect of our Churchmanship—that is, *in sacris*, in the highest and holiest function of our life. The first step towards remedy is a just appreciation of our estate; and we shall have to see that 'the Lord has included all under unbelief.'

Then we shall remember the bounty of His purpose to have mercy upon all. It may be noted that I have not used the phrase 'the churches.' I have not done so, because it is a misnomer. The modern use of this plural has nothing in common with its usage by St. Paul or by the Seer of Patmos. When the Scriptures speak of 'the churches,' they mean the different local congregations and organizations of Christians, which were spread over the Graeco-Roman world. There is the church in Ephesus and the church in Philadelphia and the church of Thessalonica; and the aggregate of these churches, which only land and sea sunder, makes up the Church, which is the Body of Christ. But the phrase is never used for an aggregate of Christian sects. It is not that sects did not exist, for we know that at Corinth there was a Paul-sect and an Apollos-sect and even a Christ-sect. But these sects were never dignified, and never dignified themselves, with the name of churches. The consciousness of the unity of the one Body in Jesus Christ was too vivid and too constantly present for them to give the name of Church to anything else. The same deep-seated belief in the one Body prevents Catholic Churchmen to-day from speaking of 'the churches.' Common parlance is often a great tell-tale; and I doubt whether anything

tends to emphasize the practical distinction between the Catholic and the Protestant outlook upon the Church more than the use of this phrase. It seems to represent an acquiescence in schism which is inconsistent with belief in One, Holy, Catholic Church. It is natural in the mouth of the politician, who as such looks at these matters from the point of view of the State, which is not acquainted with theological distinctions; but we do not welcome it from the lips of our fellow-Christians.[1]

Yet what is this One Church, of which the Creeds speak? And can we believe in it, if it exists in ideal only, and not in fact? It depends on our use of terms. By ideal I mean a determination of the Will of God—an 'idea,' in the Platonic sense of the word—which so far as it is an object of human

[1] In a recent number of this Review the Editor urged that such a term as 'Church of England' or 'Anglican Church' is no more allowable than 'Presbyterian Church' or 'Methodist Church' to those who object to giving the title of 'Church' to separated bodies; and he suggests that such objectors should, if consistent, speak of 'the Anglican schism,' 'the Presbyterian schism' etc. But there is an important distinction. 'Church of England' is a phrase of geographical origin exactly parallel to 'Church of Corinth' or 'Church of Ephesus,' and represents therefore precisely the kind of usage which St. Paul employs. On this point the titles of the various bodies in communion with the Church of England present an interesting study. The 'Church of England in Australia,' 'The Church of England in the West Indies,' 'The Church of England in Canada,' seem to be endeavours to express, cumbrously enough, an adherence to the 'geographical' nomenclature; 'The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America' lapses into the category of titles against which the Editor's objection holds good, since the word 'Church' belongs to the preceding adjectives rather than to the note of place which follows: 'The Episcopal Church in Scotland' is only saved from doing so by the alternative title, 'The Scottish Church,' which appears in its service-books; while 'The Church of the Province of S. Africa,' 'The Church of the Province of New Zealand,' and 'The Church of Ireland'—despite the objections which may be urged against the last-named on other grounds—are all faithful examples of the usage of the New Testament. [Mr. Selwyn misrepresents me. I never objected to 'Church of England' as a geographical expression. I objected to 'Anglican' and 'Roman' Church as dogmatic expressions.—Ed. *C.Q.R.*]

endeavour becomes an ideal. It is something, therefore, in the most fundamental sense of the word, *real*, even while it is not actualized. There have been times when it was actualized—in the Fourth century, for example, and again in the Thirteenth. But the last three centuries have been emphatically 'the time of the division.' It is analogous to previous times or periods in the history of God's people. There was the time of the Law in the centuries of the pre-Christian Jewish Church; the time of our ignorance, before the Gospel was preached to the Gentiles; the time of the Empire-Church from Charlemagne to Innocent III; and we are now in the time of the division. But the One Church has been real all the time; it is man who has played it false. And what we need now is the recovery of genuine belief in it, as something which awaits fulfilment in the future rather than has received it in the past. This is not to disown the past nor to break loose from our continuity with it: for the Unity of the future cannot be like that of earlier ages. To take only one example: generations, which have tasted Democracy and Federal Government, can never brook Imperialism as the permanent form of ecclesiastical polity. They belong to two different and inconsistent sets of conviction; and we cannot suppose that men will hold one philosophy in matters religious and another in matters secular. It is not an accident that the European War has found the Curia on the side of the Germanic Powers; for the Pope has the same idea as the two Kaisers as to how men should be governed and kept together. The march of history alone, therefore, would compel us to revise our conceptions of the principles which control the Unity of the Church.

This recovery of belief in the One Church is even more a necessity for Nonconformists, though in a different way. With us, the belief is often blunted, overlaid, asleep; but it is there. We think of the Church as 'no mere outcome of the natural instinct of association; no expedient afterthought, for the promotion of Christian progress in devout living and spiritual fellowship and godly knowledge.' [1]

[1] *The First Principles of the Church*, p. 17.

We agree that 'the test of the true faith unto salvation is the existence of faith unto unification. Faith supplies every defect of every Christian Communion, except the fundamental defect of resting content in isolation, discord, disunion, and schism.'[1] We can confess sincerely that 'To us, on the Catholic side, the unity of the Church appeals as a great prior fact. The individual finds a place in it; it ministers to him, or rather he lives in it.'[2] However blurred our vision of it may be, we do believe in that ideal of One Catholic Church, and we believe that it is God's Will to have it actualized on earth. But the rub with Protestantism comes there. Many of its leading writers plead for a Federation of Christian bodies instead of organic Unity. That point admits for us of no possible compromise. The intention behind it, so far as we can see, is not the will towards Unity, but the will towards mutual toleration of schism. If we impugn such an intention, it is with no idea of censuring those who hold it; but we ask them to believe that our conviction of the Church's organic unity is part of our most intimate experience of Christ and of His Spirit; and we cannot pretend that it is actualized simply because warring sects have ceased to war. It may well be that externally the present division of the Church into independent groups can be paralleled in the latter part of the First century: but the resemblance is only external; for the steady and speedy integration of the parts into the whole testifies to a will towards unity which only required the call of authority to achieve itself. Signs[3] have not been wanting in recent years that the Catholic ideal is exerting its sway with ever increasing potency over younger minds in Nonconformity—not in the direction of causing individuals to change their ecclesiastical allegiance, but in that of providing a new and larger goal for the corporate endeavour of each Christian society; and we cannot but see here the promptings of the Spirit of God. It is not without significance that these

[1] *A New Rome*, p. 67.

[2] *The Church and Religious Unity*, p. 132.

[3] The Student Christian Movement and the Edinburgh Conference have been chief among these.

signs should coincide with tendencies in Liberal Catholic thought within the Church which seem to offer new scope and elasticity in the adjustment of ecclesiastical differences. Given orthodoxy in Nonconformity as to the Church and its Worship, and humility in the Church as to the meaning of its privileges, we need not suppose that our principles of government interpose any insuperable bar to unification: rather, indeed, they may minister to it again as they ministered to it long ago. As Mr. Spens says in a fine passage: 'In an age of ecclesiastical chaos Anglican theology claims no finality, and the Anglican Church no exclusive title.' That is the measure of our opportunity; and we could approach the great Communions of the East and the West with no more powerful argument for final re-integration than the achievement, under God's good hand, of a real Catholic unity in the Christian bodies of the Anglo-Saxon world.

E. Gordon Selwyn.

Art. IV.—THE NATIONAL MISSION—A SUGGESTION, II

1. *The National Mission. How it may be conducted upon a Basis of 'Calling upon the Name of the Lord'* (1 Cor. i 2). With a Preface by the Bishop of London. By Marcell W. T. Conran, S.S.J.E. (London: S.P.C.K. 1916.)
2. *Two Chaplets of Prayer.* By the same. New and Revised Edition. (London: S.P.C.K. 1916.)

The Dean of St. Paul's has said that 'there are in each generation certain dominant ideas which tend to become a sort of framework in which all experience is set, and to furnish a dialect in which all thoughts are expressed. Anyone who wishes to influence his generation must accept this fact; he must consider how the permanent truths of religion can best be arranged in this framework, and expressed in this dialect. One-sidedness cannot be avoided when the subject embraces the whole of human life, but each

generation may contribute something to the knowledge of God, and that contribution is sure to be closely connected with its own characteristic ideas.' [1]

Yes, but we may remember that those characteristic ideas are often not expressed in any book that is brought out at the particular time. They are seething below the surface like the lava in the crater of the volcano, unseen and often unsuspected till some man of insight appears, touches his generation with a light that reveals the age to itself and enables it to realize and express the truth that it had obscurely felt but could not appropriate and proclaim. Then all depends on whether the new truth is wisely applied, or wrongly, in which case it will only tend to confusion, and throw back the cause of true religion, it may be for generations.

It was so at the end of the Seventeenth and the beginning of the Eighteenth centuries, both in England and France. The people were miserable body and soul, in both countries, and in a state to welcome any message which might offer them power to endure, or a hope of better things : and then, there came in England the Methodist movement, and in France the worship of the Sacred Heart, both bringing men to realize the love of God in Christ for each single soul. In each case, it was the message people needed for the day, and it was recognized ; people woke up to a new joy and gladness of heart, which all the sorrow of the world could not depress ; once more men saw and heard ' things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man.' The message was given now in a way men could understand, take home, and put into practice ; again men perceived that salvation was really come to them.

There is the same great craving to-day, seething below the surface of society, and ready to burst forth at any time either for good or for evil, according as it is directed into right or wrong channels or else left without direction to carry men where it may with no set purpose or end in view except the gratification of impulse and emotion.

We believe that God will give us the message we need as

[1] *Truth and Falsehood in Religion*, p. 3.

an outcome of the National Mission in answer to all the prayer that is going up to Him day by day, for 'Lord, thou hearest the desire of the humble: thou wilt prepare their heart, and thou wilt cause thine ear to hear.'[1] But we must be fellow-workers with God, not only as we pray, but also as we think these things out, that we may be able to recognize the Good that God desires to give us.

We may then consider what seem to be our special needs.

1. *A watchword.*—We know the use the Germans have made of their watchwords as the war has gone on. We know what 'to Paris' meant at first, and also the corresponding discouragement when the effort failed. Then it was 'to Calais' and then 'to Verdun.' All these watchwords were definite points to make for, and expressed to the men more than even the actual taking of the towns would have been if they had been able to carry out their plans.

We need to-day a watchword which may express to men the cause we have in hand, something that all can understand and appreciate, something which can interpret to them what we mean, and inspire their imagination to accomplish it.

2. *Unity.*—It is pathetic to think of all the brotherhood-meetings and such-like that have been held, and then to look at Europe, or even the state of our own land to-day.

All the causes which make for strife are with us still, and ready to break forth at any time, as lately in Ireland. In England we can trust both capital and labour to put on one side their differences in the face of the enemy. But after the war is over it is difficult to see any hope that things will not be worse instead of better than they were before.

3. *Power.*—So we ask Where are we to look for the power that will enable employers of labour to look to the good of their workmen as keenly as they do to their own success and profit; and enable the labourer to work for the good of the whole, his country, his neighbourhood, and his family, instead of simply getting another penny an hour to be spent too often in more drink, because he has never learned any higher way of enjoyment?

[1] Ps. x 17.

Legislation fails us, for if a considerable number of people decide not to keep the law, it cannot make them. Neither is force any good. The Germans used it, and it makes for a certain efficiency with them, but it is unthinkable that we should follow their methods, and we should only have civil war in a few months if we did.

There is only one other power that has ever worked in the world.

Religion has saved nations before, and it may save us again if, by the help of the Holy Spirit, we can bring it to the hearts and minds of the people in such a way that they can understand, appropriate and exercise it.

4. *Reality.*—If the religion we are to teach is to bring the power we need, it must not only be real in itself, but it must be given in such a way that its reality will be felt by those whom it reaches. As John Wesley preached the power of religion came home to people so strongly that men were often struck to the ground under the force of sudden conviction. Perhaps some of us can understand a little of what it was to them by the recollection of what we felt once as we listened to a great singer singing such a hymn as 'Abide with me, fast falls the eventide': the simple words became filled with new power and life; the awful realities of life, of God, of Heaven and Hell struck full upon us. One does not soon forget such an experience. It was not only real in itself, but it was given in such a way that the truth became real to us. So the reality of religion comes home to some in one way, to others in another, but all need to have it presented so that it may impress them.

The Methodists felt it, under the preaching of John Wesley; and the message has never quite faded from our land. To-day again, men and women are waiting: they have learned religion by rote in Day and Sunday Schools without understanding or feeling it, and so it was easily left behind when they went to work. It was no help to them, for it had never brought them to God personally.

5. *Action.*—The artist feels all the beauty and truth and power of form and colour, but it is vague and unrealized till he has expressed it on his canvas. The musician, the

writer, the preacher, all alike must express their thoughts and feelings in writing or speaking, before they have made them their own, otherwise they will neither satisfy themselves nor help their fellow-men. It is the same with religion: our preaching and teaching will be useless unless it leads to result in definite action ; it must make for a definite object that all can appreciate, and find their part in : otherwise we shall only stir up desires which will probably die down again as the effervescence in a glass of mineral water.

We do not seem generally to possess the power to bring forth new ideas, but we are good at recognizing what is of value elsewhere, and assimilating and improving on it. Our Prayer Book is taken for the most part from pre-Reformation devotions which we have revised for our use. So with the Good Friday 'Three hours service,' which came to us from abroad; so with 'Retreats' and 'Missions,' and so with many of our hymns which we have borrowed from almost every possible source.

May we not do the same once more, and find what we need from an old devotion, which for hundreds of years has proved helpful to millions ? May we not take the ancient Chaplet of prayer as the Reformers took the old public offices of the Church, and, like them, revise it for our use to-day, and find in it a simple way by which to present religion to the hearts and minds of people, so that they will find by it a real approach to God ? I believe that the great mysteries of the Life of our Lord which have been recited and meditated by Christians for hundreds of years will be found to give us what we need.

The united prayer going up from the great body of our people, if they will accept it, will bring us together in one spirit, and as we pray 'Save us and help us, O Lord,' by all the merits which Christ won by each event of His Life on earth, we shall liberate for our help that power which strengthened the early Christians under all persecution, and at last converted the Roman Empire. Each time we recite the devotion, we shall feel more and more the reality of all that Christ has done, and still does for us in Heaven, as some of us know who are accustomed to use it.

I need not repeat what I have written on the Devotion in my books on the National Mission and in my *Two Chaplets of Prayers*, but I have written this chiefly to appeal to those who feel that something more is needed in our own Church and land, and that such a devotion and teaching offer a true way to meet it. If any feel that I am right in this, I would ask them to practise the devotion of the chaplets themselves, for it is impossible to teach it to others unless we have learned the help it brings to ourselves. I know how serious a matter it is for men perhaps past middle life, who have probably settled down to a regular routine of devotion which they are satisfied with, to begin something that, however long used by the Church, is so new to them.

Yet, we can remember, it is not like adding more collects to those we usually say, for it fixes our minds on the events of our Lord's life, in such a way that we can continually meditate on them, and turn them into prayer instead of exclusively dwelling on our personal sins, our wants and our feebleness, which is so depressing.

This Devotion can easily be remembered, because it gives us the events in the Life of Christ in order, and we can recite it anywhere, and at any time, at home or in church, out walking, or in a railway carriage. I received a letter the other day from the vicar of a church in East London, who told me he had put the Devotion in large letters at the end of his church, and that on his rounds in his parish he found a washerwoman, who had copied the words down, and learned them off by heart, and was accustomed to say them over her wash-tub. Can we do better than follow her example and get the words off by heart, so that we can say them at all times and seasons ?

Here is a Devotion where we can be at one with the illiterate and the newly converted, for all can understand the facts of the Life of our Lord, yet none can ever outgrow the contemplation of them ; each event will ever have fresh mysteries to unfold to us, however long we may meditate upon it : and as we practise using the Devotion, we shall do it for God and our country. Not for our country only.

Patriotism, if there is nothing behind it, is apt to die out, unless there are fresh calls continually coming to renew it, but it is for our country as the instrument which we believe God has chosen in order to work out in the world His plan of free churches, and free nations, which yet are one, each helping instead of hindering each other, and working out their own salvation under His guidance, as He has appointed to each, not in mere uniformity but in spiritual union one with another.

For God and our Country.—May not this be our watchword which may rally our people, express our object, and inspire our hearts and minds? It is a venture, but it is worth while, the method is one based on hundreds of years of experience, and, if it is taken up, it will have, we may well hope, the same far-reaching results that it has had elsewhere, and which some of us can bear witness to in our own lives.

I verily believe it may awake a new spirit of devotion amongst us, and prove the beginning of a real return to God, who has said 'Return unto Me, and I will return unto you.'

M. W. T. Conran,
Of the Society of St. John the Evangelist.

Art. V.—WHAT IS CATHOLICISM?

1. *A Spiritual Pilgrimage.* By R. J. Campbell, M.A., Priest of St. Philip's Cathedral Church, Birmingham. (London: Williams and Norgate. 1916.)
2. *The Fulness of Christ.* An Essay by Frank Weston, D.D., Bishop of Zanzibar. (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1916.)
3. *The English Church and Re-union.* By Arthur Chandler, Bishop of Bloemfontein. (London: Methuen and Co. 1916.)

4. *The Religion of the Church as presented in the Church of England: A Manual of Membership.* By CHARLES GORE, D.D., Bishop of Oxford. (London and Oxford: A. R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd. 1916.)
5. *A Book of Instruction for Church of England People.* By W. J. CAREY, M.A., R.N., Chaplain of H.M.S. *Warspite.* (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1916.)
6. *The Renewing of Catholicism. Evangelical Essays towards Religious Renewal and Unification.* By SINCLAIR BURTON. With a Foreword by the Rev. W. B. SELBIE, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. (London: Robert Scott. 1916.)
7. *The Episcopal Church: its Faith and Order.* By GEORGE HODGES, Dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1915.)
8. *Church Divisions and Christianity.* By WILLIAM LEIGHTON GRANE. (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd. 1916.)

NOT long ago, the Editor of this Review received a letter asking why it had ceased to be 'Catholic.' As there has been no change, in tone or temperament or purpose, in our pages for the last fifteen years, it was difficult to know the ground of any such accusation. Our purpose has been, so far as we are able, to learn what a knowledge of Church history and a sober judgement might shew were the principles which had prevailed throughout the whole history of Christianity, and to teach these in opposition to the temporary and partial ideas which are continually being put forward and claim to represent Christian truth. In other words, we have tried to teach what is really 'Catholic' in opposition to the many changing fashions which are continually usurping the name 'Catholic.' That has been our aim. But the complaint that is made shews that there is probably no point at the present time which causes to many greater difficulty than the use of the word 'Catholic,' and the question what is really 'Catholic.' We purpose therefore, with the assistance of some recent books, to make an attempt at investigating that question.

I

The first of these is the *apologia* of Mr. R. J. Campbell, as written to explain the fact that he has accepted ordination in the Church of England. He gives us some account of his life and of his spiritual experience. There is a great deal that is open, frank and attractive about his writing, but those who come to the book expecting any great light upon the problems of the day will be disappointed. There is no sign of deep religious experience, of real intellectual grasp, of any subtle psychological analysis, of any probing to the depths of the spiritual life. The writer lives on the surface of thought. Within these limits, much that he writes is interesting, even acute. He has the orator's capacity of picking up the striking point in a controversy or an argument. He takes an interest in everything that people have been thinking about. He has all the equipment fitting him to be the intellectual guide of large classes of his fellow-countrymen who ask for nothing but plausible talk about the interests of the day. He is a journalist preacher, for a journalist age.

Amongst the experiences of his early years in Ireland his account of a Communion in the Irish Presbyterian Church is full of interest.

'It would be no exaggeration,' he writes, 'to say that the doctrine of the Church as taught to me in my early days was as "high" as anything I have learned since. And nothing could be more solemn and authoritative than the teaching we received in regard thereto. Admission to the Lord's table was a very serious matter even for communicants of long standing, far more so than in the average English parish church at the present time. It was fenced round by restrictions that would hardly be considered tolerable in England at all, certainly not by Nonconformists. . . . Those who are to-day agitating in the Church of England for the restoration of the Lord's own service, as it is rightly called, to the central position in public worship would have been impressed by what took place in our house of prayer on Sacrament Sabbath. There was no question in any one's mind as to the priority of that service

over all others. It was no addendum, no mere extra tacked on to ordinary worship. It was a great service by itself—*the* great service, to which all else in the Church's life was subordinate. It was the chief means of grace to which Christ's people could look. We children were allowed, and indeed expected, to be present at it, but only as spectators. The experience was a useful means of preparing us for the supreme privilege which was to be ours by and by, if we were counted worthy of being initiated into the fellowship of this holy mystery.'

It is, we think, valuable to have this account of the Sacrament in a religious body which High Church people would consider unsacramental. It may suggest to us that it is possible that the excessive repetition of the services of Holy Communion and the continuous desire to make it 'the service' on every occasion may have the effect not of increasing reverence for it, but of diminishing it ; that we are more likely to look upon it as the principal service if it is not made the common service of the Church.

There is much in Mr. Campbell's pages of value especially, we think, to the clergy in the Church of England. His experience has told him of the great importance of making people interested. That perhaps is the great difference between the Nonconformist minister and the clergyman of the Church of England. In the Church of England, normally, no attempt is made to interest the congregation either by the sermon or by the service. There is not the same need—or there was not. It is clear that to make interest the predominant feature in a service may be very dangerous ; but that is no reason why we should not learn some lessons from the successful Nonconformist minister.

Important, too, is what Mr. Campbell says—and we think says very truly—about the value of a great preaching station. The City Temple is a preaching station with a vast personal congregation—a congregation coming to be taught by one particular man. Still more interesting perhaps is the testimony which he gives us several times of the large number of Anglicans who were members of his congregation. It emphasizes the fact, which any one who knows London will really feel, that it is 'preaching stations' that are needed there.

Let us suppose that the great body of Christians in London were united in one ecclesiastical organization. It would certainly not be possible to meet all spiritual needs by the uniform parochial organization. It never has been so. In the Middle Ages people demanded the monk and the friar; in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries the Jesuit church competed with the Roman parochial church. We must have our preaching stations; we want them now, in fact; and a wise administrator would do all that he could to train capable preachers and establish such centres.

Another point that one notices is the way in which a teacher like Mr. Campbell and the congregation which he teaches seem to be influenced and affected by many of the intellectual controversies of the time, which are hardly thought of over a large extent of the Anglican community. We can read about them if we turn to the pages of the *Hibbert Journal*, where they always bulk largely. The discussion which arose on the distinction of Jesus and Christ, the attacks on the historical reality of our Lord's existence, the talk nowadays about such things as 'Mystery Religions'—all these bulk very largely for a certain type who are at a certain stage of intellectual development. They imply generally a union of intellectual interest and want of sound knowledge. Each movement passes away after a few years. One feels that there are a great body of people who are very much at the mercy of the last book. At one time it was Hatch or Harnack; then it became Schweitzer. Now they are changing round and thinking about quite different things. The point we should emphasize is, that to that class very little help or assistance is given in the Church of England.

But one cannot dwell upon these points any longer. Our purpose in citing the work is the question which Mr. Campbell's re-ordination raises. His work is of great value in putting before us the thoughts that are in the air at the present time, but not in giving us a solution. Perhaps the point of view which the book suggests, and a large number take, is one which sees two big truths without being able to harmonize them. The first is that, whatever theory of

the Church we may hold, we cannot deny the reality of spiritual work in other religious bodies. This is the point that Mr. Adderley emphasized in his sermon.

'Dear brother,' he said, 'whom it has been my privilege to know and love for many years, you have an advantage over many of us in that God the Holy Spirit has so clearly shewn you that He is with you and is calling you, long before you were called upon to answer the question in the Ordination Service. To deny the work of the Holy Spirit in your former ministry would, for me at least, be to risk the commission of the unpardonable sin.'

And in accordance with this we have Mr. Campbell's own statement. 'I believed myself to be no more and no less truly a minister of Jesus Christ after I had been ordained in the Church of England than I was before.' That on the one side. And then on the othere there is the absolute necessity of Episcopacy, and of episcopal ordination.

'This brings us back to the point of episcopacy. It is absolutely requisite that the historic episcopate should be accepted by all the non-episcopal bodies, or formal unity we cannot have. The historic episcopate represents the framework of Catholic solidarity, and the sign, symbol and guarantee of the unbroken succession of the ordinary as distinguished from the extraordinary ministry of the Christian Church. It is this ordinary ministry which is associated specifically with the altar, or rather the presbyteral order is so associated. The very idea of the altar in its Christian use may legitimately be said thus to depend upon the fact of the historic episcopate; the one implies the other.'

And elsewhere he writes:

'To the question, Why does succession matter either in the society itself or its ministers, I would answer, because all life is fundamentally one. Nothing is unimportant that helps to demonstrate that oneness. You cannot legitimately sever the present from the past, or the substance from the form. You cannot cut off one part from another and dub it secular or sacred, material or spiritual, at your discretion. Outward and inward, lower and higher, they are one; the less the expression of the greater.'

And again:

'Could any one reasonably contend that our Saviour's valedictory prayer in the upper room at Jerusalem would find an adequate answer in the perpetuation of such a state of things as exists to-day wherever His gospel is preached and His name held in honour? It were impious to think so. He did take pains to ensure both unity and continuity as far as these could be ensured by any specific and definite act in addition to His own plain words, and that was by appointing a ministry whose authority was never afterwards deputed but by the laying on of hands as far as any record of apostolic practice survives.'

It is not necessary to quote more; these bring out quite clearly the two conflicting currents of thought that are agitating the minds of those who think about such things at the present time. Mr. Campbell has various means of reconciling them. He would suggest that the Nonconformist ministry has really all it claims. It claims only to be a charismatic ministry, a ministry of spiritual gifts, not a sacramental ministry. This is only partly true. It may be largely true, probably is of many Congregationalists, but not of the more old-fashioned bodies, to whom the Sacrament is a great and real thing, quite truly a means of grace, as in fact Mr. Campbell has himself testified. He suggests that for the sake of unity all Nonconformists should be willing to accept re-ordination, with the special stipulation that they do not and cannot recognize that their ministry heretofore was not of Christ's ordinance. Perhaps there should be a conditional form of re-ordination: 'If thou art not already ordained.' This would regularize the position for the Catholic, and would not invalidate it for the Protestant. And he thinks that possibly the Church of England might do the same thing some day in relation to the Church of Rome.

None of these suggestions seems really satisfactory. The problem is an involved one—one which will never be solved theoretically, which would probably be solved easily if the desire for reunion on both sides were real.

II

The Bishop of Zanzibar's essay on *The Fulness of Christ* is, like Mr. Campbell's book, in a sense apologetic. It is a defence of the position that he has taken with regard to the Kikuyu question; and very rightly he gives his reasons, not in a controversial spirit, but working out his theory of what for him the Catholic Church means. We have seldom read a book the criticism of which has seemed to us more difficult. The author is very earnest. He lives in a lofty region of devotional life; and no doubt there is much spiritual beauty and aspiration in his character. But also we have never read a book which seemed to us less conclusive in its argument. It is throughout based, not on the study of Scripture, not on the study of Church history and doctrine, but on deductive reason. From a certain number of premisses which the author assumes he deduces the conclusions that he desires, and of course any cogency these deductions may have will depend upon the validity of the premisses. And it will generally be found, we think, that these are so chosen as to contain in themselves the conclusion that is desired.

Let us take an illustration. He wishes to prove the need of one visible Church. In order to do so he starts from the doctrine of the Atonement, and puts forward a theory as to its meaning largely derived from Dr. Moberly.

'Had the Christ,' he writes, 'in His Mystical Body been apprehended as living, atoning Saviour, manifesting and fulfilling penitence in every age, we surely had not fallen victims to the many mechanical and forensic notions of propitiation that have ruled our conceptions of salvation. No theory of individualistic salvation would have been possible; nor could any charge of injustice and immorality have been levelled against the doctrine of the Cross.'

And then he goes on:

'The Vicarious substitution for man of one with whom he is allowed no substantial union; the predestination of Calvin; the divorce between the Creator's Anger and the Saviour's pity; these and all other immoral theories need never have

been, if only the visible expression of the Mystical Body on earth had remained one in actual organization, mind and heart.

'Is then more proof needed that to the atoning work of Christ down the ages one visible Church is necessary?'

We do not think the above quotations are unfair specimens. The argument is that, supposing you assume a theory of the Atonement which demands a visible Church, then it is conclusive that you must have a visible Church in order to justify such a theory. But as a matter of fact the conception of Christ as fulfilling penitence in every age is one which was not, so far as we know, developed until the end of the Nineteenth century, at a time when the Church was very much disunited, while during the period when there was one visible Church there were many crude and inadequate theories of the Atonement prevailing.

When we turn to the doctrine of the Church we find a great deal which is very difficult to grasp. We discover that the Church may be interpreted in three different ways. There is the essential Church, there is the accidental Church, and there is the visible Church.

'The question may be asked whether the accidental Church is one with the visible Church. And to it an emphatic negative must be returned. For at all costs we must not confuse the soul of the Church with the essential Church, and its body with the accidental Church.'

'It is the accidental Church to which are given in Scripture the epithets of Bride, and Body, and Kingdom. The essential Church is the Bridegroom, the Head of the Body and the King.'

'The accidental Church is the sum total of those who, by the response of their free wills to the grace of the Spirit, have been incorporated by baptism into the essential Church, the Manhood of the Christ.

'All that has ever been in the visible Church has its place in the accidental Church. . . . But there may be many in the accidental Church who never found their way into the visible Church.'

All these conceptions seem somewhat bewildering; but so far as we can gather the real point is that you have to distinguish the visible Church from the great company of the

believers who are baptized. The reason for such a theory is obvious, but it is very difficult to find any justification for it.

When he turns to the episcopate, the Bishop of Zanzibar uses language which may not unfairly be called exaggerated.

'The Episcopate is, without any reasonable doubt, the historical basis of the Church, disclosed to the world as the Apostolate proper ceased to be. . . .

'There then is the fact: clear, evident, and truly indisputable.'

It is really rather foolish to talk in this way, because of course this is just the one question which is disputed, and however indisputable it seems to Dr. Weston to be, his business is to convert other people who do not agree with him, and that he cannot do by such methods of argument.

And then he goes on to argue on *a priori* grounds that the episcopal system must have been by the divine purpose, for 'God is a God of detail.' Now what sort of value will arguments like this have to any who differ from him? Dr. Selbie for example writes: 'For my own part I have no hope of anything like corporate re-union, and I shall be sorry to surrender the advantages which accrue from variety in forms of Church government.'[1] It would be just as easy for the Bishop of Zanzibar to take as his premiss that God, as shewn by the nature that surrounds us, is a God of variety in His manifestations, and that therefore variety in the government of the Church was in accordance with His design. Or he might argue that God is a God who is manifested by growth and progress, and that therefore the ideal of episcopacy, which belonged to older generations, naturally develops into something fitted for other conditions. The fact is that by Dr. Weston's methods of argument you may prove almost anything.

Perhaps as much criticism will be directed against his views of the priesthood. He not only gives the very highest position to a priesthood on earth, but argues that this earthly priesthood must be eternal, and exist in the heavens;

[1] *The Renewing of Catholicism.* Foreword.

and therefore that we must accept as an essential part of the Church's life the ministry we call the Catholic priesthood —that is the episcopate and the ministry episcopally ordained. We had certainly always believed that, whatever theory we held about the priesthood on earth, it would be merged in the one universal priesthood of Christ in the heavens; and we are still more astonished when we find the words 'Thou art a priest for ever' used, not of the priesthood of Christ, but of the earthly priesthood.

We ought, we think, to quote in full the Bishop of Zanzibar's definite statement in regard to Kikuyu.

'Nor can objection be justly taken, in view of this meaning of the Mass, to our refusal of communion in it to those who are not, heart and soul, active members of the brotherhood. There is something incongruous with this idea of corporate worship in their presence who are not wholly bent on deepening their sympathy with, and service in, the common fellowship. And the suggestion that any one should go out from his communion in the Holy Sacrifice to a life consecrated in a separate organization, opposed in some of its fundamental principles to our fellowship, is entirely impossible. It is not only that the brethren are rightly scandalized and wounded thereby; for that in itself would not be, to many minds, a final argument. It is that Christ, whose Death the Sacrifice shews until He comes, died that at His coming we might all be one in visible unity. So that the Church's loyalty to her Lord and her duty of witnessing to Him who is the truth, alike require of her a stern warning to any Nonconformist who seeks occasional communion with her, lest, finally, his continuance in separation be laid to her account.'

I think that it would be equally easy to argue on similar lines in favour of occasional Communion. I do not think that there could be any better statement of the aim of those who took part in the Kikuyu Conference than that they were 'wholly bent on deepening their sympathy with, and service in, the common fellowship'; that they were making every effort at a visible union and that therefore it might be argued that there was nothing more suitable to their circumstances than that they should unite in one common Eucharist.

People's feelings are different, and you cannot argue from one man's feelings to another's. Nor is it right either way to decide such questions by feelings.

The real fact is, as we read Dr. Weston's book, that we feel that he has allowed himself to be overpowered by his own point of view. He has probably done as much as most people at the present time to throw back the possibility of Christian re-union on lines which would ultimately have ended in just that episcopacy on which he lays such stress. How does it come to pass that such a good man should do this? We feel that St. Paul's words are very true of him: 'He has a zeal for God but not according to knowledge.' And this has arisen from his allowing himself to be carried away by his own theory, and thinking that it is God's theory. We have never read, we think, a book on such a subject as this which made less use of either the Bible or the records of Christian theology. He has allowed himself to spin out of his own mind his theory of what the Church is, and should be, instead of continuously correcting it by what the New Testament and the Christian Church generally has said. That leads to much exaggerated language, to much that, from the point of view even of what is called advanced theology, is very precarious, and will drive him more and more into isolation. Is he not confusing self-will with conscience, like so many other people?

III

The Bishop of Bloemfontein writes about the English Church and re-union in a somewhat more sober style. With him too the method is deductive. He starts from the idea of dependence, and dependence leads him to place his chief emphasis on sacramentalism. Now such a deduction is legitimate, but it is not of course necessary. A Calvinist would say that he quite agreed that the essence of religion was dependence, and that was the ground of his conception of the absolute power of God and the complete submission of man. The Evangelical would tell us that it was through faith that we exhibited most definitely

our dependence. Moreover dependence is only one element in religion. The fact is, as we shall find, that the Bishop of Bloemfontein is describing the aspect in which he sees the Church of England. It is a coherent whole; it is an attractive representation of a certain type of religious life. But he seems to suggest, further, that it is not only a legitimate but a necessary representation, and no arguments that he uses are capable of proving that. Throughout he writes in a moderate spirit, and no doubt he is anxious to be able to find a place for Evangelicalism in his system. But surely he has no right to say this:

'If, on the other hand, the interpretation [that is, of Dependence] is conducted on Protestant and rationalistic lines, we are left with nothing more than Culture and the Higher Criticism.'

To any one who knows religious people whose point of view is Protestant, could any statement be more unjust than that? Far better is the Eirenikon he suggests:

'Simple evangelical piety may well be accepted by all serious Catholics as the *end* to be attained; whilst Catholic creeds and sacraments should commend themselves to serious Evangelicals as supremely valuable *means* for the attainment of the end. In proportion as we are serious, we can come together; as long as we remain frivolous partisans, of the mud-slinging and brick-heaving sort, so long union will remain impossible.'

Valuable also is what he says about historical facts as an essential part of our religion. From the beginning what has differentiated Christianity from almost any of the rival systems of religion is, that it was based upon definite historical facts.

'The mysteries of Dionysus, of Isis, of Mithra, all professed to guarantee communion with the deity. . . . Their one simple and fatal defect was that they were not true. There was no such person as Dionysus, or as Isis, or Mithra; they were myths constructed by the imagination on a basis of misunderstood ritual.'

We cannot build up Christianity except on historical truth.

And the criticism that he has to make on the modern critical attitude is sound.

'We find that the critical attitude is largely, though perhaps unconsciously, influenced by the philosophical, and again a critic's philosophical denial of miracles is often facilitated by the assumption that such denial does not have any adverse effect on genuine religion. . . . The whole situation is somewhat baffling in its complexity. For instance, when we attempt to grapple with questions of strict historical evidence, we find that point after point is prejudged from the side of philosophy. We want to inquire whether certain miracles actually happened, but are contemptuously forestalled with the dogma that no miracle can ever possibly happen. If, in deference to this fresh consideration, we examine the philosophy which thus makes miracles incredible, it is itself buttressed by the assertion that, at any rate, historically they have not occurred, but represent the non-critical inferences of superstitious minds. And so the circle goes merrily round.'

He finds that history proves three things: 'the authenticity of the Gospel story; the hierarchical organization of the Church in the threefold ministry; and the appeal to Councils as the seat of ecclesiastical authority.'

He then discusses the relation of the Church to individual responsibility. He is attached to the principle of authority, and shews a strong desire for discipline; but he is most anxious to preserve individual responsibility. The influences that work, he says,

'are appeals to the conscience, to the filial, brotherly, historic, social conscience of fellow-Christians. And this is a fact for which every one who values religion must be profoundly thankful. . . . The real authority is moral and spiritual; this alone can deal with the delicacy and complexity of moral and spiritual problems; and the ultimate seat of such authority must be the moral and spiritual character of those who exercise it.'

Equally strong is what he says about confession:

'I believe thoroughly in confession and appreciate its value, for myself and others; and I wish the number of those who

practise it were enormously increased. But I have an obstinate and stubborn conviction that freedom is of the essence of all moral and religious action; and it seems to me especially clear in this matter of confession, that the value of the act depends very largely indeed on its being freely performed; compulsion cannot secure the sincerity and contrition which make a good confession, and may easily produce qualities which make a bad one.'

And he sums up his argument with a phrase of the greatest value (derived ultimately from Bishop Creighton):

'The *Ecclesia Anglo-Catholica* embodies a distinct religious type. She is the Catholic Church for free men.'

Whether his system would quite carry that out we may doubt. His ideal is a high one, but he is, it seems to us, rather too anxious for discipline. He suggests that the great object of Christian re-union is to make discipline more possible. We are afraid that if he puts that argument forward it will be quoted by many as a sound reason for not encouraging re-union.

He ends with his conception of the lines upon which re-union will come. He will have nothing to do with federation, which he calls 'play-acting.' He does not believe in the triumph of any one claimant. He says that:

'We shall attain Reunion when we share in one life, the Life of Christ communicated through appointed rites, a Life which shall gather up into itself all the existing organizations, efforts, and aspirations of a divided Christendom. This Sacramental Life, safeguarded and guaranteed through the Apostolic ministry which conveys it, will act as a real unifying bond.'

We do not want to be too critical; there is a great deal of value in what Dr. Chandler writes. But we cannot help feeling that, after all, the only re-union he can look forward to will come by everyone agreeing with him and accepting his presentment of Christianity. And as regards this, we notice two things. We notice first of all that its centre, as the centre of that of the Bishop of Zanzibar, is not that

of the Catholic Church. The central thought of the Catholic Church has always been the Incarnation and the Christian life. The sacraments are subsidiary to these; and it is just in this undue emphasis on the sacramental that we think his error lies.

The second point is that, clearly, his conception of Christianity is narrower than that of the Church of England. How many sound Evangelicals, how many pious and good Broad Churchmen, would be able to find a home in the Church which he had organized? When we look at the number of those who accept his particular point of view, and then on the other hand at the great mass of often ardent and pious Evangelicals whose work in the mission field, where they may be compared with him, is often far more successful and, as it would seem to us, inspired, we cannot see how any re-union is possible if our conception of the Catholic Church is to be such a narrow one. For, with all his mysticism, and all his piety, and all his goodness, the Bishop of Bloemfontein's conception of Christianity is narrow. It is far narrower than the Church of England; and we can only lament the unsatisfactory influence of a disestablished Church.

IV

The Bishop of Oxford has written a little work, *A Manual of Membership* of the Church of England, to meet what he says is a clamorous demand at the present time—something which may be put into people's hands, that they may learn what the Church of England teaches, and what their duties as members are. It is much what we might expect from him. It has much of great value. In some directions we shall have to criticize it. Before doing so it is necessary for our purpose to see how it is met by some who do not agree with him. We have a review by the Dean of St. Paul's in *The Guardian*.[1] He particularly attacks the Bishop for Romanizing tendencies.

[1] *The Guardian*, October 26, 1916, p. 915.

'The school to which the Bishop belongs plainly wishes at all costs to keep our communications open with Rome. Some extremists in this party are almost avowedly conspirators who wish to return to the "Roman Obedience." The majority flatter themselves that they can pull to pieces the most closely knit and coherent structure ever raised by the wit of man, taking what they please from the Latin Church, and rejecting the rest.'

The criticism is probably quite fair of certain modern theologians. It is difficult to conceive anything that could be said of the Bishop of Oxford which would be more unjust. By a curious coincidence, the same number of *The Guardian* which contains this review contains the report of a speech made by the Bishop on Inter-Communion at the Anglican and Eastern Association. In that speech the Bishop said that:

'With the most passionate desire to do anything to promote the realisation of the Catholic idea, he confessed that as he looked out he saw little chance of reunion in the direction of the great Roman communion. The more he studied it the more he saw that everything that was distinctively Roman Catholic was bound together by an extraordinary coherence of tendency and spirit which received its chief embodiment in the Papal autocracy. Nothing was more idle or futile than to take this or that distinctively Roman feature and say "Let us assimilate it," because it all had this extraordinary quality of coherence which was particularly expressed in the institution of the Papacy.'[1]

Nor was Dr. Inge in any way justified by the book before us in his criticism. Nothing could be more definite than the Bishop of Oxford's statement:

'And if we are wise we shall never imagine that we can, in admiration of Roman efficiency, seek to acclimatize amongst ourselves the Roman system without the Pope. The whole ecclesiastical development in the West during the later middle age and subsequently has centred in the Papacy, and is of one piece with it. And if we are not intending to submit to the Pope on his own terms, we must in all respects seek to maintain

[1] *The Guardian*, October 26, 1916, p. 912.

and build up our system on the principles of the ancient church and the Holy Scriptures.'

Any one who knows the Bishop of Oxford and his teaching knows that he has probably throughout his life taken as strong and definite a line as any one in England against the encroachments and the false teaching of the Church of Rome, and that he has done so with the sober learning and judgement which are so entirely absent, for example, from the tirade against Rome in which the Dean of St. Paul's quite irrelevantly indulges.

Dr. Inge then goes on:

'But when the Roman Church adds a perfectly logical corollary, and declares, as it does with great emphasis, that an Anglican Bishop is a layman and a heretic, we are to repudiate its authority. And on what grounds are we to repudiate it? In virtue of a theory of Catholicity which is rejected by all other Catholics, and which is peculiar to a sub-section of a sub-National Church on an island in North-Western Europe: a theory which divides all other Christians into those who unchurch us and those whom we unchurch!'

He has now amplified these words by a more definite statement.

'A Western European who rejects the authority of the Pope can no more be a "Catholic" in the institutional sense, than President Wilson can be an Englishman. It is surely for the Great Church, not for seceders from its rule, to decide who are citizens and who rebels; and the decision has been given against us.'[1]

These words would be almost humorous if they were not so perverse. Dr. Inge first makes one of the most bitter attacks on the Church of Rome that we have had in recent years and then asks us to accept its judgement as to what is or is not 'Catholic.' That he does so shews that he deliberately refuses to see the point of view of those whom he is attacking. The claim of the Anglo-Catholic party in the Church of England is that an examination of the history

[1] *The Guardian*, November 23, 1916, p. 1003.

of the Christian Church shews that during the period of the undivided Church before the rise of the Papacy Christianity presented certain characteristics—institutional, ecclesiastical, sacramental, doctrinal. These combined to form a society to which the name of Catholic Church was then given, and are held now to constitute the principles of Catholicism. The Papacy, whether Mediaeval or Tridentine, is a violation of these principles.

To assert then, as Dr. Inge does, that the only standard of Catholicity must be conformity with the Roman Church is deliberately to ignore the whole question at issue. It is further untrue to Church history. There can be no doubt that the Church of the first three centuries may claim the title of 'Catholic': it exhibits just those principles which the Anglican Church tries to present; but if conformity to Roman standards be the one test of Catholicity, then the primitive Church was lamentably deficient.

But this is not the whole argument for the Anglican interpretation of Catholicism. The Dean of St. Paul's appears entirely to forget the existence of the Orthodox Eastern Church, and to ignore the fact that the principles upon which it is based are, broadly speaking, those on which the Church of England is built up. There are certain distinctions, but they are neither numerous nor important; and there is more and more a tendency on the part of the Russian Church to reciprocate our interest in it, as the same number of *The Guardian* will shew.

'Bishop Bury,' it says, 'described the remarkable welcome he had received from the Metropolitan of Petrograd and the Metropolitan of Moscow, both of whom spoke quite openly and without reserve of the possibilities of closer relationship with the English Church as the real basis of a permanent political friendship. The same spirit, he said, was most marked among high officers of the Army and Navy. "We must now come together in Christ's religion," they said.'[1]

As a matter of fact, the somewhat meagre report of Bishop Bury's very remarkable speech minimizes very

[1] *The Guardian*, October 26, 1916, p. 912.

much the impression that he left on the minds of those who heard him of the definite desire for re-union in a large part of the Russian Church.

Now the Dean of St. Paul's is quite free to controvert this position. He may shew that it is unsound. What he does is to ignore it, to refuse to understand that it is the position that the Bishop of Oxford holds, and deliberately to accuse him of Romanism. But the position the Bishop of Oxford holds is different from that of the Church of Rome, in fact quite inconsistent with it, and in the opinion of many the strongest and most logical barrier that exists against Roman claims. The ill-considered language of the Dean of St. Paul's represents probably the greatest service that has been done to the Roman cause for a long time.

As regards the Bishop of Oxford's work, there is much in it which we would gladly quote, as representing the result of earnest religious thought. There are however three criticisms that we have to make. The first is, that his presentment of the life of the Church of England seems to us a disproportionate one. He lays far too great emphasis on the institutional side. His point of view may be represented by those who are dwelling to an excessive extent on the fact that our soldiers do not know what to do in the same way that a Roman Catholic does. This is not, we think, the right question to ask if we wish to consider the success or failure of Christianity. Christianity is primarily ethical. The question we should ask is What sort of man is the soldier whom the Church of England sends out? If he fails, and in so far as he fails, morally, so would we think the Church of England has failed in its mission. In so far as he is a brave, courteous, humane, self-sacrificing man, so far has she succeeded.

Earlier in my life I had a good deal of experience which taught me perhaps to correct a tendency to lay too much stress on the institutional side of religion. I left Oxford and went to a parish, and I soon found that just those who were what is currently called the best Churchmen, who had a complete grasp of all the ecclesiastical principles involved in membership of the Church of England, and never willingly

neglected a single ecclesiastical duty, however trivial—that just these people were often singularly deficient in everything that one associates with real Christianity. They were hard, uncharitable and narrow, and often did more harm than good to the cause of Christianity. It was most pathetic that those who were prepared to give themselves up with great zeal to a somewhat rigid creed should be able to do so little to promote their cause. I often found a deep and real grasp of Christian piety and Christian ethics amongst men and women who, on the ecclesiastical side, were singularly lax.

And then I found that, whereas the Church of England, its sacraments and its institutions, were an admirable guide to life, and an admirable guide to a parish minister, and that the system of the Church of England was excellent, on the other hand the system was not what should be preached. The two things that would appeal to the great body of our fellow-countrymen were, on the one side the moral conceptions of Christianity, on the other the message of the Gospel. It was not that they alone were sufficient; it was not that the ordinances of our Church were unnecessary or useless appendages. They are the greatest help that any minister of religion can have. One of the greatest of the advantages we have compared with the Nonconformists lies in the fact that we have an institutional system which is adapted to every stage and crisis in a Christian man's life. But we must never allow the system to overpower the spirit. Our preaching must be the faith and the Gospel. The system should always be subservient to these. And this has always been the case in great presentments of Christianity, and in the history of the Church. We can read many volumes of the Fathers and find comparatively little about the Church system which they taught and practised; just as we find singularly little about the institutions of Christianity in St. Paul's epistles.

Now this proportion the Bishop of Oxford does not observe. We begin with two chapters: 'Membership in the Church,' and 'The Catholic Faith,' both of them dealing with what I may call institutional or ecclesiastical Christianity.

Almost the whole of Christian doctrine is summed up in one chapter, 'The Doctrine of God and of His Creatures,' which occupies twenty-three pages, while the next chapter, on 'The Church and the Sacraments,' occupies thirty-four pages. We have one on 'The Last Things and the Communion of Saints,' which occupies twenty-eight pages, and includes such questions as prayers for the dead, and the comprecation of the Saints. We have a chapter on 'Christian Morality,' but it is to a considerable extent not ethical, and even in it we cannot get away from 'the rules of the Church of England.' Then follow a short chapter on 'Prayer,' and a chapter on 'The Bible.' The last, on 'The Church of England in the Larger World,' goes back largely, though not entirely, to ecclesiastical questions. It is just this disproportionate emphasis laid on what is valuable and important, but not central, that impedes so much High Church teaching at the present time. How little does an average attendant at church hear of all those questions of Christian ethics and morality which are troubling him. In old days there were churches where it was not considered right for a sermon to be preached without reference to the Holy Communion. Now it is the Mass, or Confession, or even the adoration of the sacrament; and the persistent emphasis on particular aspects of Christianity wearies the hearers. The fact that we have to remember is that while all men are potentially religious, only a very few are ecclesiastical and take an interest in ecclesiastical matters.

The second criticism we have to make is that we think that a bishop writing a manual of this sort should scrupulously adhere to what is definitely taught in the English Church, and not confuse together two things, the Church as it is and the Church as he wishes it to be. In two directions this might be emphasized. The Church of England does not teach the seven sacraments. It teaches two sacraments, and the Bishop of Oxford recognizes that that is quite a legitimate point of view. It would be far wiser if he grouped together penance, holy orders, etc., under the heading of Ordinances of Religion. The second illustration is the emphasis that he lays on prayers for

the dead, on the keeping of All Souls' Day, and the practice of comprecation. If without definite authority we can bring in new usages and customs, the example may be followed in many directions. If we introduce an All Souls' Day, what would prevent others introducing a Corpus Christi? Or why not expand in another direction and have united prayer meetings with Nonconformists in church? I suppose everyone thinks there are points where the worship of the Church might be enriched or modified, some in one direction, some in another. It is quite right and legitimate that we should seek to make it better. But in a Manual of Membership of the Church, ought not we to confine ourselves to what the Church definitely and formally teaches? And particularly if we are inclined to insist somewhat rigidly in the case of others on what the Church does or does not allow.

A third criticism that we have to make upon the Bishop of Oxford is the manner in which he uses the authority of the New Testament. He holds, as we are well aware, a very rigid view on the subject of marriage and divorce, and when he comes to deal with the Scriptural basis of the doctrine he tells us in so many words that we must neglect the exception made in St. Matthew's Gospel, as that represented an opinion different from our Lord's. Now so far as regards what is sometimes called the lower criticism, the words 'saving for the cause of fornication' are undoubtedly part of the text of St. Matt. v 32. There is no authority at all for deleting them. It must be, therefore, on the grounds of the higher criticism, because these words do not occur in St. Mark's Gospel and are added in St. Matthew's, that he holds that they are a later addition to our Lord's words. Now that is a dangerous position to take up. The only justification of such a point of view would be to say that additions in St. Matthew to the Marcan narrative which are not contained in St. Luke's Gospel are of doubtful authenticity. But if he holds that, it at once becomes apparent that a good many of the texts he is fond of quoting would have great doubt thrown upon them. For instance, in particular, the passage about the

authority of the Church added to St. Peter's confession. That is a section contained both in St. Mark and St. Matthew. Certain additions are made in St. Matthew, and there is no authority for them in St. Luke. I cannot see any other scientific basis for his statement; and it is certainly a most dangerous thing to set aside passages of the New Testament with which we disagree on any such grounds. It is just what we should criticize with extreme severity if it were done, for example, by Dr. Rashdall, and it leads to substituting a subjective for an objective basis of the Christian doctrine. The whole of such criticism is most unsubstantial. It simply means that we leave out those passages that we dislike. It is quite possible that our Lord should have laid down the general law of Christian marriage without necessarily inserting on every occasion an exception. It is quite natural that one person should report the law without the exception, another with it. There is no reason for thinking that St. Matthew had not other sources of information besides Q and St. Mark. But in any case I do not see what solid basis or authority we can have unless we recognize that we must accept the Scriptures as they are. That is what the Bishop of Oxford claimed the right to do in his book on the Christian ministry. Surely if we believe at all in the providence of God we must hold that these Scriptures, which come to us, as the Bishop of Oxford reminds us, with the full authority of the Christian Church, must, in the purest text that we can get them, be an adequate doctrinal authority. Nor is there any inconsistency in admitting the exception. Our Lord puts quite clearly the Christian ideal of marriage; but He will never give us a law too hard for human nature. He will teach us principles rather than rules, and He would allow the Church to modify the rigidity of what, when taken up into a State law, might become dangerously harsh. We want moderation and reasonableness in all things.

Of the other books at the head of this article Mr. Carey's *Book of Instruction for Church of England People* is in many ways good; he writes from the same point of view as the Bishop of Oxford, but with far greater humanism

and closer contact with life. He will have his seven sacraments, although he carefully distinguishes the two from the five lesser ones. Dr. Hodges provides a useful manual describing the Episcopal Church of America. Mr. Burton discusses more definitely questions of Re-union. Mr. Grane makes an eloquent appeal for Christian Unity. 'Our first endeavour must be to saturate ourselves with the idea of unity, until we are thoroughly convinced of its beauty and power. It is only by the steady propagation of Unity as an Ideal that we can hope to generate the passionate enthusiasm needed to cope with the overwhelming obstacles to its realization.' He discusses in successive chapters 'The Ideal Forsaken,' 'Broken Christendom,' and 'The Path of Recovery.' He contrasts Roman Immobility with Anglican Opportunity, the Divine Spirit and human systems. The tone and temper of the book is admirable.

V

I hope it may not appear too egoistic, but I think that the best means I can take for estimating the presentations of Christianity given us by these three bishops is to compare them with my own opinions. I do not wish to do so with any undue estimation of the value of what I believe; but because ultimately these things do come to the clash of individual points of view and it is better sometimes to confess that frankly. Now the difference is that everything that I learnt as principles I find in them transformed into dogmatic statements, into rules and regulations, into a system which always tends to get more rigid.

If I look back on the growth of my own opinions, I find that I learnt (and I learnt much from the Bishop of Oxford) that there were great Catholic principles quite apart from and independent of Romanism. I had abundant opportunity of studying the history and theology of the early Church, and it seemed to me that I found these principles clearly presented there. Chance brought me into contact

with the life, the organization, and the writings of the Eastern Church, and there too I found the same principles exhibited. Nor when I studied either the writers, the Liturgy or the formularies of the English Church did I fail to find the same principles embodied, presenting it as clearly something different from the other reformed communities.

But it was principles only that I could find. For instance, there seemed to me ample proof of what may for convenience be called the Historical Episcopate; but when I came to examine either its origin or the theories as to its meaning held at different periods I could find no justification for rigid practice or teaching. Still less could I find authority for rigid views or teaching concerning the sacraments. Again if I compared the theology of the Anglican and Eastern Churches they seemed fundamentally remarkably alike, but in detail and presentment the differences were great. The Eastern Church spoke of seven sacraments; the Anglican of two sacraments and various ordinances: but if I turned to the early Church I found, while all seemed to place baptism and the Holy Communion on a different level from other sacraments, there were many theologians who knew of even more than seven sacraments. If I compared the Eastern and Western presentations of Catholicism they were fundamentally identical, but if I turned to the embodiment of these principles in church rules or orders the differences were considerable. Primitive, Eastern, Roman, Anglican, I found great resemblances, but great variety in detail. The Anglican presentation of these Catholic principles seemed to me quite adequate, but clearly distinct from other systems; and nothing could be gained by pretending that it was not. In fact this diversity seemed to be not only admissible but necessary. If Catholic principles were secured, Catholic rules, ritual, customs might vary indefinitely.

But now I turn to the writings of these three bishops, and I find in all the rule overpowering the principle. Each in his own way is becoming rigid. If they could all remember how they thought before their principles became fixed,

if they could remember the element of uncertainty there was in proving many of their positions, if they could remember just a little more how many good people there are who do not agree with them, they might hold the positive beliefs that they do, they might express them in their life and worship as they do, but the tone and temper would be very different.

I feel sure this change is disastrous. It is diminishing the influence of the High Church party, it is alienating many even from the Church of England, above all it prevents the Bishop of Oxford from doing what he might. There is no one for whose combination of intellectual and spiritual qualities as we knew them at Oxford, thoughtful English people outside the Church of England felt more respect, no one who might do more to help to draw Nonconformists (many of whom are in their way High Churchmen) towards us, no one whose principles and presentation of Christianity have been more attractive in this and the last generation. But if he will surround himself with a hard, even prickly envelope he deters just those whom he might hope to influence.

VI

We have examined these books, all of which have appeared recently, with the object of finding out so far as possible an answer to certain questions. What is the Church? What do you mean by Catholic? What is the place of authority in religion? What can be the basis of Christian reunion? We must own that we have found little real answer to these questions. Much is said about the authority of the Catholic Church, and of the duty of being Catholic; but we are never formally told what the Catholic Church is. In fact there is clearly confusion of mind between two different points of view. The one admits definitely that the Church is the great body of the baptized believers; the other sees the Church in the bishops. It is to meet, of course, these two points of view that the Bishop of Zanzibar has his two Churches, the accidental and the

visible. But that is hardly a solution that will strengthen his position. So, in the same way, what is Catholic? What is the basis of Catholicity? That again is not clearly laid down. It might be held, for example, that the principles of the undivided Church were Catholic. A good deal is put before us now of which the undivided Church knew little or nothing. The agreement of the Eastern and Western Churches might be claimed as a proof of Catholicity; but when the worship of the reserved sacrament comes in, even that is dispensed with, and the unsupported custom of the Roman Church is considered a sufficient authority. There is, in fact, a serious failure in much modern thought on theological subjects in getting a sound basis. 'Catholic' almost comes to mean 'what I like.' It certainly means 'that system which seems to me to be coherent, which I have become used to, which has become embodied in my religious life, and I can think of as the only true presentation of Christianity.'

We have tried in a previous number of this Review to put forward a theory of the Church which may help us. We cannot doubt that the visible Catholic Church on earth is the great company of the baptized believers. That Church is marred and imperfect, because of sin; so, whereas it should be one and united in its life and fellowship, holy and pure and true in all its members, teaching the way of Christ in its fulness, it is in actual practice something very different. The true Church must be, so long as we are on earth, an ideal to which we attempt to approximate, and some element, probably, of the ideal of that Church is preserved in every Christian sect. It is only when all come together, as we pray that they may do, in the great consummation that the perfect Catholic Church will exist.

Let us apply this principle. We have commented on the *a priori* method assumed by the Bishop of Zanzibar, and to a certain extent by the Bishop of Bloemfontein. How are we to correct this? Surely by two things: by constant study of the Bible with a view to learning what it teaches, and by a constant study of the teaching of Christ in His Church. But here we should

never confine ourselves to any one particular branch or section. Catholicity is not to be found exclusively in any one or in any group of what are called at the present time Churches. There may be elements of Catholicity everywhere. We would study with as reverent and as humble a spirit the writings of Calvin as the writings of St. Augustine, of Luther or St. Athanasius, Hooker or Chillingworth or Laud, and we could learn from all. Just as the ideal hymnary of the Church contains the piety of every religious body, so the true theology will be built up by the study of the theology of all Churches and of all great divines.

We come now to a further question: What is Catholic, in the sense of what should be the basis on which we can build up any theory of the Catholic Church? Now we quite agree with the Bishop of Zanzibar that the Catholic theology does not mean that theology in which all or nearly all Christians unite. It means the most complete theology in which all Christians should unite. But that will take many ages to build up, and we want something more practical. We want to try and find out whether there are certain great principles on which we may ask all Christians to come together. There is great diversity between East and West, between primitive and mediaeval. What have they in common? What can we insist upon as the basis of union? Is there a *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*? What full expression of the Church's teaching is there? May we, for example, accept anything like that which is commonly called the Lambeth Quadrilateral? It is, we know, at the present time considered rather old-fashioned to dwell upon these things. Our up-to-date theologians are either like the Dean of St. Paul's, who would preach a sheer individualism that confesses that it has no policy, or are ardent Young Catholics, as they call themselves, who would rush to everything which is taught by the Church of Rome. Yet we are going to venture to restate and examine once more the old-fashioned points as an expression of what, in our opinion, is really Catholic.

And first the Scriptures. Theoretically every one

admits their supremacy, but there is certainly a tendency in various directions to undermine their authority. Criticism or philosophy does it on the one side, and over-exaggeration of the importance of Church teaching does so on the other. We are not concerned at the moment with the particular methods of interpretation. The Church has handed down no doctrine of inspiration; but from the very beginning it has put forward the Bible quite prominently as the source, the one source, of true Christian teaching. This is apparent in the earliest days of Christianity, and must be sufficient. We do not ask any one to adopt any theory of the way in which the Bible is inspired. We are quite prepared to allow him, if he desires it, very considerable freedom of criticism. We are quite certain that it would correct itself in time. What we do insist upon is the paramount place of the Bible as the source of all revealed knowledge of God.

And then secondly there is the Church. What does the Church teach? There is, first of all, its formal teaching. That is summed up in its Creed. And there is, secondly, the whole content of Christian theology. Our attitude towards these two is of course somewhat different. The Church's creed, if there is a creed which is put forward with definite authority, must be our main guide to what is the truth. The whole body of theology must be a constant source of spiritual learning to us.

Now there is one Creed, and only one, which can really claim to be the Church's Creed: that is, the Creed in its uninterpolated form which we call the Creed of Nicaea. It was put forward by the Council of Chalcedon as the Creed of Constantinople, that is, with the definite authority of an oecumenical council; and was accepted afterwards by all the Churches of Christendom. We cannot get anything which, formally, has more authority. And it is on that basis, and that alone, we believe, that Christians can unite. That contains all that can be authoritatively put forward as Catholic.

Not only has the Council put forward that Creed as a sufficient definition of the Faith, but it definitely condemns

any one who adds to it or subtracts from it. 'It shall be unlawful for any one to produce another faith, whether by writing or composing or holding or teaching others.' And it anathematizes those who presume 'either to frame another faith or to publish or teach or deliver another symbol.' The language is very explicit; and it might quite well be argued that most of the evils of the Christian Church have arisen from an excessive desire to add to the Catholic Faith. The evil began with the addition of the *Filioque* clause and the schism of East and West; it went on with the Western Church and the dogma of transubstantiation; it thereby gave the basis of authority to all the excessive sacramentalism of the later Middle Ages, and produced the conditions which caused the Reformation. The evils were increased when every national Church produced its own confession of faith, adding clause after clause to what it held necessary. The final disaster was the two Roman Catholic Councils which added the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibility of the Pope to their creed. It will only be by going back to the Creed—which means going back to Christ, for the centre of the Creed is belief in Christ—that we can hope to unite. There are many of the points upon which the Churches are divided that we cannot settle, that we never shall be able to settle; and we can only unite by recognizing that they are not points which it is necessary for us to agree upon.

There are two further questions which have been raised. The one would say: Why have a creed at all? Why not go back to the simple confession of faith in Christ which was all that the Apostle demanded? 'If thou confess with thy lips that Jesus is the Christ, and believe from thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.' The answer must be that the simplest creed was not found sufficient in practice, that we have, as a matter of fact, this creed coming with real authority; and that Christianity as a historical religion must be united on an historical basis.

The second point is: To what extent do we demand any particular interpretation of this Creed? The Bishop of Bloemfontein quite rightly says that the appeal must be

ultimately to a man's honesty. The Bishop of Oxford is anxious to insist upon certain necessary interpretations.

'These events in our Lord's human life which have fallen within the scope of human experience can be expressed in literal human language. Thus He truly was born of the Virgin, and truly died, and truly after His resurrection appeared to His disciples and ascended to heaven. But, so far as concerns what lies outside human experience, what concerns His going to the place of departed spirits, or hell, and His "sitting in heaven at the right hand of God," we can only use symbolical language.'

He would therefore demand quite a literal acceptance of certain propositions, though he would allow a certain amount of interpretation as regards others. It is doubtful whether we can make this distinction. The ascension into heaven, for example, is clearly symbolical in its language. And I believe that the only basis of acceptance can be that a man must be able to say the Creed with honesty and sincerity as expressing his religious beliefs. It must be remembered that any attempt that we make to enforce any particular interpretation must mean really adding to the Creed, because any interpretation is an addition. The Church of England, like other bodies, has its own private Thirty-nine Articles. It uses the Athanasian Creed. It has other documents embodying its teaching, which we may quite reasonably look upon as guides that it puts forward of its interpretation of Christianity. They do not bind the laity. They are guides to the clergy. At the same time we believe that quite safely we may dispense with every other form of symbol, in the sense, that is, of condition of membership, and may put forward the Scriptures as interpreted by the Christian Creed as an adequate basis of Christian union.

Then, thirdly, there are the sacraments. No one can doubt that Baptism and the Holy Communion are practices enjoined in the Gospels. Confirmation, penance, marriage, orders, are all ordinances of the Church, useful and necessary for Church life. Some office for the visitation of the sick every Church would have, and at certain periods the symbolical use of oil has formed a part of it. But no other

sacrament can have the same authority as the two sacraments of the Gospel, and they are the only two which we should demand. The rest will come. The local church will quickly learn to select what other churches have to give which is edifying. But there is one direction where agreement will never come. Since the unfortunate day when Berengarius was condemned for his eucharistical doctrine until the present day, there has been no possibility of agreement in the definition of the sacraments. And there is no Catholic doctrine. The attempt to define has produced more divisions than, probably, any other cause, and every definition has been inadequate. At the present time it is the custom for many theologians of the English Church to speak of the doctrine of the Real but Spiritual Presence as a Catholic expression. This quasi-symbolical use of the expression, 'the Real Presence,' is, I believe, confined to the Church of England. It is singularly incorrect in terminology, for 'real' should mean 'material.' It has certainly no authority and no claim to be put forward. It is only an attempt made by certain divines to sum up what they believe to be the teaching of the early Church.

The sacraments are an essential part of the Church's worship. It is the duty of the Church to celebrate them in accordance with her Lord's commands. It is her duty to make such rules and ordinances as are necessary for their due celebration. But our Lord gave no command as to a particular definition or belief. The basis of union is not to lie in a belief in any particular theory about the sacraments, but in fulfilling our Lord's command by using them 'with the full use of the words of institution.' If we could once acquiesce in the position, which is almost that of the English Church, and was almost that of Hooker, that, namely, of accepting the sacraments without demanding any definition, we should be going back to the practice of primitive Christianity and arriving at the real basis on which union might be possible. There can be no doubt of the genuineness and reality of the belief in the sacraments in the early Church. It is equally true that there is very great variety in the expression of that belief. We can find language which

is almost Zwinglian side by side with language which seems to imply high doctrine. The formal belief of each single Christian who worships in the same church is really different. He may or may not have formally adopted a theory, but that theory will rarely correspond with any exactness to his belief or to the answer which the sacrament gives to his religious needs. To celebrate the sacrament as Christ ordained, to allow the usage of the local church, to expect that local churches would gradually if reunited approach one another might be a basis upon which the Christian Church could unite.

And now as to organization. Is there to be one framework which is to bind together the whole Church, or are we to agree with Dr. Selbie that variety of organization is desirable? Is it not possible that both ideals might be combined? We look at the mediaeval Church and we see a society in which religious life was very varied in its character. As soon as men outgrew the earliest forms of Christianity, local organization of worship alone did not seem adequate. The religious society grew up. And side by side, whether in the primitive Church, or in the mediaeval Church, besides the normal parochial and diocesan system, we find religious orders, not local in their organization, meeting varied religious demands, and appealing to the variety of temperaments in human nature.

We turn to the present time, and we find much the same variety of religious life, but with one essential difference. Whereas in the Middle Ages all forms of life were united in the unity of one society, in England they are represented by various and conflicting societies. We have in the Church of England the ordinary diocesan and parochial organization, but it is not adequate to meet the religious demands of the time. Even in the Church of England we are finding that is the case. There were the old proprietary chapels; there are the modern religious communities. And outside the Church of England we have many bodies of Nonconformists who are growing less and less different from one another or from the Church of England in essential points of doctrine, and the basis of whose existence is that they

represent different aspects of Church life and different forms of religious piety. There is not, I believe, in the nature of things, any reason why, as in the past, this variety of life might not be exhibited in one society, and that the Church of England as the local branch of the Catholic Church. Our Church of the future must clearly not be narrow in its exhibition of Christianity.

And if this is so, the episcopate has claims which no other system of Church order has to be recognized as universal. It has the authority of antiquity. It goes back to the first ages of the Church. It has the authority almost of universality. It represents an order both strong and elastic. But the episcopate that we want must have two characteristics. In the first place, the traditional ministry of the Church is not the government of the Church by bishops, but the three orders of the ministry, bishops, priests and deacons; the recognition of the rights of the presbyter in his synod, and the recognition further of the fact that the bishop is but the mouthpiece of the whole Church. And secondly there is no Catholic theory about the bishop. To make the episcopate a question of creed, as the Bishop of Zanzibar does, is to depart from Catholic order, for it means adding an article to the Christian faith.

What seems necessary as a basis of Church Order is the acceptance of Episcopacy and the rule of Episcopal Ordination. Both have oecumenical authority. In a Church thus worked there might be room for the Wesleyan society and the City Temple. The question of the recognition of the orders of other bodies (if re-union take place) will be balanced by careful preservation of the combined succession in the future.

VI

All the writers we have reviewed have laid considerable stress on the authority and the discipline of the Church. The Bishop of Zanzibar has two definitions of authority: one is rigid—almost tyrannical; the other mild and reasonable. We will take the latter:

'The authority of the Church,' he says, 'is based upon the movement of the Divine Spirit in close union with the redeemed spirit of the human race, that is, with the spirits of multitudes who see God in varying degrees of vision. It is also another name for the corporate witness of a living society to the fact of its own foundation and history. And, in the abstract, no better basis of teaching, no more trustworthy witness to facts, can be found anywhere. No other human society of so high standing and reputation would be refused the last word in a dispute as to its own history. The writers of the Church are as a body at least as famous for knowledge, accuracy, and genius as any other select body of teachers; and her ministry has provided her with a means of handing on tradition that has no real likeness outside herself.'

If we take this as our definition it may suggest that what we mean by the authority of the Church is that, as a guide to what is true in religion, we cannot divorce ourselves from the history of the Christian past. The authority of the Church is not anything which comes to us with demands that we must believe this or that. It is not a rigid code of rules which every one must keep. It is the guidance of the great body of Christian teachers from the beginning in our quest for the highest divine truth. Such a view of Church authority we believe to be the right one, and we think that it is the greatest mistake to attempt to impose any other authority upon Christians. Of course it is quite true that the Church is represented in a parish by the priest, and the priest is subject to a bishop, and it is their mission to teach what they believe to be true about Christianity, and they give us what the Church gives us; and most Christians will receive their knowledge of divine things through some such means. All that is quite correct as a picture of machinery. But they must not claim to have any greater authority than being the means by which a man's own spirit is stirred.

And if the Dean of St. Paul's would consider this a moment he would see that it is not inconsistent with his demand for development. 'We want,' he says, 'no more revivals; we want new and free developments.' Yes,

but in what direction, on what lines, and from what starting-point? Science or history or philosophy all repose upon a basis of human authority, not dictating but informing. And surely that is just what we require in the Christian Church. Let us by all means go on. Let us use everything that modern times can give us of philosophy, science and criticism, to get a higher degree of truth. But if we divorce ourselves from the Christian past we shall become faddists and cranks, just as scientific men who start without knowing Newton's laws of motion, or a philosopher who attempts to build up a system of metaphysics without having read Plato.

All the bishops whose writings have been reviewed are a little too anxious to revive discipline. There is a discipline of the Christian Church, but it is a discipline which is self-imposed. The Church rightly puts forward its moral teaching, which is the interpretation of that of its Master; its ordinances, which have been built up under the guidance of God's Spirit; and it bids men discipline and strengthen their minds by learning what it has to teach, by practising what it recommends. At various periods in history it has attempted more than this. It has attempted a more or less strict system of ecclesiastical discipline. Sometimes it has gone to terrible lengths. The Inquisition and the Puritans of the Reformation, in their zeal for their side of the truth, tried to impress a hard, rigid system upon mankind. Such attempts have always failed. They have always done infinite harm. For they are entirely opposed to the very genius of Christianity and to the teaching of Christ. The discipline of the Christian Church, the discipline of Christianity, is that which each man takes to himself and imposes upon himself with a free conscience. Naturally he may seek advice; naturally in times of trouble and perplexity he may confess his sins and seek absolution. He may feel himself weak in many directions, and want the strength which habit can give. Those who are appointed to advise and guide him will warn a man of what he requires, but discipline in the form of compulsion is alien to the whole spirit of Christianity.

We have tried to picture to ourselves what are the principles on which a true Catholic Church should be built up. We have tried to sketch what might be the basis of Christian reunion. We do not do so with any unreal hopes or illusions as to the possibility of much being done at present. We write with the feeling that this is a problem that every one who is concerned with such things should try and think out for himself. We should like to take as our motto the wise words of the Bishop of Bloemfontein, that the Ecclesia Anglo-Catholica should be the Catholic Church for free men. That is our ideal. And if we have occasion to criticize both the Bishop of Bloemfontein himself and his colleagues in the episcopal office whose works we have reviewed, it is because we hardly think that they have quite the courage to carry out to the full this ideal.

ARTHUR C. HEADLAM.

ART. VI.—'JEAN BAROIS.' THE FRANCE OF YESTER-YEAR

Jean Barois. Par ROGER MARTIN DU GARD. (Paris, 1914.)

IN *Jean Barois* M. Martin du Gard has given us a book of unquestionable power and force. The war has thrown many things out of date, but this novel at least has a present interest, for it brings us to the verge of the great struggle. In its later pages we come very near the France of to-day. We see something of the mental and spiritual process that has been preparing her for her present ordeal, we see what one of the characters calls 'La France nouvelle—La France de la menace allemande, la France d'Agadir.'

The form M. Martin du Gard has chosen for his work is curious, and characteristically modern. It approaches to the Cinema Play. *Jean Barois* is written throughout in dialogue, with notes which act like stage directions, giving

just as much running commentary as is needed to provide a setting. The method has its advantages. Concentration of interest and a certain vividness are the result. The changes of scene flicker past quickly,—and the characters have just that air of being over-charged with significance, even in the slightest movement and gesture, that oppresses us at the Picture House. Sometimes explanatory letters are thrown upon the screen, to fill in gaps in the story, sometimes for a moment the film jerks by, blank and void, when we turn an extra page. The illusion of the cinematograph is produced—and seems, in some odd way, rather suitable to this modern theme.

The story deals with the life and death of one Jean Barois. His wife, his child and his friends appear, his political interests, his social surroundings, his life-problems, domestic, emotional and intellectual, are dealt with. We get to know all about him very thoroughly, and external as the Cinema-play form would seem in its plan, we know still more about his mind than we do about his outward circumstances. Yet, when we lay down the thick yellow volume we feel that Jean Barois himself is not the chief subject of these five hundred-odd pages. What we have been following, with rather painful interest, is not so much his career, as Faith's part in it. We have been dwelling not so much on his personal faith or want of it, as on Faith in a larger sense, the fortunes so to speak of Faith on her way through the waves of this troublesome modern world, the way in which she is rejected or received, the terms of assent she can evoke, the accommodation offered to her in different individualities. The Venture of Faith, in a word, is the romance that underlies, that is expressed through, the life story of Jean Barois.

The author's attitude is a distinctive and curious one, a characteristic product of these latter days. Had the life of Jean Barois been written some years ago, the relative values would all have been different. Then the believers would have been shewn as a 'feeble folk,' like the conies. The sentiment, the aesthetic appeal of their position would have been sympathetically touched, and their weakness respected at the best, insulted at the worst, at all events

patronized. But the power, the energy, the dominance, the hope for the future, would have lain with their enemies.

In *Jean Barois* the situation is viewed from quite another standpoint. The defensive has passed to the other side, the pathos and the tragedy have gone with it. In former days, believers moved through the Romance World timidly, dreading an attack at every step, shielding the flickering unprotected flame of faith against the blasts of unbelief that assailed it at every turn, and doing so rather with the energy of despair than of hope. Now, if we are to believe M. Martin du Gard, the tables are turned.

Jean Barois must cherish the integrity of his unbelief with jealous anxiety, he must safeguard it, if possible, against the dangers that press in on every side. And danger comes from within as well as from without. There are traitors in the camp, strains of feeling, inherited tendencies, that may play him false at any time. For years he goes on his way with an obscure almost subconscious fear preying on his mind, forgotten at times in the hurry of action, coming near the surface in moments of discouragement or depression. To be an unbeliever is to stand, as it were, upon a tiny island in the great sea of faith, world-enveloping and immense. It washes up all around, and wears away the island till there is scarcely standing room left. To maintain oneself there in safety is terribly difficult, and grows harder as time goes on. Forget where you are, let the concentration of your mind relax, and you may lose your precarious foothold at any moment: the hungry sea of faith will engulf you, once and for all. That is much the position in which Jean Barois finds himself. It is no 'creed outworn'—this that has suckled him, but a dangerous dominating faith, 'terrible as an army with banners.'

We see him first as a twelve-year-old lad, motherless, and under the care of his grandmother. The mother had been consumptive and Jean is threatened in the same way. His grandmother takes him to Lourdes. There is no cure in his case, apparently, and the long journey nearly proves fatal to the boy. The story begins just as the father realizes what is going forward. The lad is almost ready

to die in a pious rapture. The father steps in as doctor, and in a curious interview he infuses his energy and will to live into the sickly, languid creature, and shakes him back to life with a not unkindly hand. The Doctor is 'incroyant,' but there is no attempt to interfere with the boy's religion. 'Je compte même beaucoup sur ta piété, pour te soutenir dans cette lutte,' his father tells him.

Jean grows up in a pious, narrow circle, in his provincial home. He lives an eager spiritual life, in a very hotbed of piety, his emotions probably over-stimulated, and outrunning his real capacities. As time goes on, there are signs of reaction. He begins to question, to seek some intellectual ground for the emotional superstructure. Like Man Friday, he is concerned about 'De permission ob evil.' He consults the parish priest, a good, simple, unintellectual old man. 'M. l'abbé, je crois que j'ai des tendances à devenir libre penseur,' he says in all seriousness. M. l'Abbé is privately amused, and gives him the conventional answers, which leave him as much and as little satisfied as thousands of others have been before him. So far, the story, save for an unusually keen insight into character, is commonplace enough.

Later on Jean goes to Paris, and lives with his father, in order to attend classes at the Sorbonne. There the emotional religion of his boyhood fades out, in the uncongenial atmosphere. Other influences turn up. A young Swiss priest, of pronounced modernist views, is Jean's 'voisin de laboratoire.' To him the old difficulties are confided, and are met in a new way. To begin with, the problem finds a new statement which gives precision to the situation. 'Voyons,' says the Abbé Schertz, 'd'une part votre raison, qui se blesse à des points de dogme, et qui refuse de les accepter, et d'une autre part votre sensibilité religieuse, vivace, très vivace, qui a goûté Dieu, si je puis dire, et qui ne peut plus s'en passer.' Jean hails this putting of the case with eager satisfaction. He understands himself the better for hearing his own attitude so clearly defined. But the counsels of the Abbé do not quite approve themselves to the neophyte. They do not seem to him to meet the

whole case. 'Dans la religion catholique . . . tout se tient, et si on en rejette une fraction, on perd l'ensemble,' he argues. The Abbé urges that all dogmas may be accepted and all treated as symbolic and figurative. 'Ainsi,' he cries exultantly, 'vous avez la solution de toutes les difficultés.'

One carries away a vivid impression of that conversation. It begins in the Abbé's room, in a *pension* in the Place S. Sulpice. It is interrupted by the church clock, reminding them of their classes. They rise, and, still talking, cross the Place S. Sulpice, passing between the grey-pillared mass of the church and the great fountain of the theologians, and so to the Sorbonne. One can almost see the moving figures on the film. They part in the echoing corridors of the college, where the students are hurrying past, on their way to the different 'courses.'

Then Jean tries to put his ideas in order. 'Un moyen de reconstruire,' that is what he seeks, and what the Abbé offers him. Can he accept the Abbé's interpretation of religion? Considering the matter, he stumbles on a thought that recurs again and again, and makes one of the leading motifs of his life. 'C'est la seule chance de l'équilibre qui me reste.' That is, at bottom, what he seeks, '*un équilibre*'—'Un déséquilibre atroce' is what he first complains of to the Abbé.

Two thirds of his trouble lies outside himself. He is realizing for the first time that want of faith is a not unusual condition. 'L'ambience de Paris, l'ambience surtout de cette Sorbonne' has produced this effect on his nerves. His father does not believe, for one thing. Then he meets others in the same case. Magazine articles come his way. He produces one while he talks to the Abbé. He has not verified the destructive assertions in it himself. Whether they are correct or not hardly changes the question for him. His trouble is caused by the disconcerting fact that there are people to say such things and who find a sympathetic audience for them. That, not what they say, is the upsetting thing. His attitude is not an uncommon one. It is other people's doubts rather than his own that affect him.

Two letters, inserted, cinema-fashion, between the conversations, finish the story of this period. First in a brief note, full of details of college work, Jean incidentally mentions his gratitude to the Abbé. 'Vous m'avez pour toujours apaisé . . . je vous dois, pour la vie entière, une foi compréhensive et calme, robuste en son fond, conciliante en sa forme.' A couple of years later there is another letter, chronicling a later stage. 'Ce terrain symboliste est trop glissant, on ne peut y faire qu'un arrêt provisoire.' He is now decidedly 'incroyant,' finally emancipated.

The new standpoint must be adjusted by Jean to two different claims, that of his employer, and that of the wife he has married some year or two since. In the case of the former, the matter is simple enough. He lectures on physical science in a college under clerical supervision. It is run on broad lines, and for some time Barois teaches what he thinks, undisturbed. At last there is a crisis. The Director comes to listen to one of his 'courses' and then sends him a message, recommending discretion. Jean resigns, not the less readily because the message had reached him through his *dévote* and somewhat interfering mother-in-law. So the connexion is at an end.

The adjustment of his relation to his wife is a more difficult matter.

It would be unreasonable to carp at an ill-assorted marriage as a literary motive. That the wrong people should choose each other is the very *raison d'être* of the modern novel. But really the marriage of Jean Barois is more than usually ill-judged. Cécile is devout, narrow and obstinate. Her link with Jean had been formed in his boyish days of fervour. Before marriage his attitude towards her had been the time-honoured one in which the man approaches the maid in French literature. He asks himself the usual question—'A quoi rêvent les jeunes filles ?' —and finds it unanswerable, as the typical hero of the French novel has been finding it for generations. And surely the answer which a clever man like Jean Barois is quite unable to furnish must be a wonderful affair when it does come to light. He feels sure of that. That after all it should be

entirely commonplace and obvious never even occurs to him.

Cécile's mind and soul being alike mysterious to him, he proceeds, in the absence of precise information, to invest her with a suitable equipment of qualities, wrought from the stuff of his own imagination. He credits her with delicacies, intuitions, mystical perceptions that half awe, half allure, him. He sees her perpetually in a 'dim religious light.' From coarse pleasures, such as come his way in Paris, he turns to the thought of her, as to a sort of spiritual refuge.

When he proposes to her he is still standing, somewhat uncomfortably, on that 'terre trop glissante' of modernism. He still clings to a shadowy figurative interpretation of Christianity. He debates with himself whether he should try to make his position plain to Cécile, but by the advice of the Abbé Schertz, he gives up the idea. Perhaps it is not very clear to himself, by that time, just how he stands in various matters. At all events Cécile marries him in the belief that he fully shares her own religious sentiments.

Very soon, for Barois at least, the disillusion is complete. At close quarters, the mysteries of Cécile's character disappear. Her piety, he finds, is materialistic and superstitious to an extraordinary degree. Her nature is *bourgeois* to the core. Though not exactly an ascetic himself, he is repelled by a streak of sensuality that runs through her nature and allies itself even with her religion. But perhaps what he can least forgive her is the terrible comprehensibility of her character. In investigating it, he finds himself, not wandering, as he had imagined, in mystic forests, but perpetually running up against stone walls, or even barbed wire fences! Her very simplicity, the ease with which he can see through her little wiles and understand her motives, is intolerable to him.

Before long he finds himself definitely ranged on the opposite side to his wife, in matters of religion. Modernism cannot hold him. The loss of his post in the clerical college emphasizes his change of attitude in an unmistakable way. Then there are mutual recriminations and accusations, misery for both. Jean spends his life in making

ungracious concessions, that degrade him in his own eyes, yet never satisfy his wife. She has indeed legitimate enough grievances of her own, but not one glimmering of pity or sympathy for him, while he is constantly torn with compassion for her. Yet he shews a bitterness and moodiness not likely to conciliate. His contempt and her rancour make bad house-keeping together.

Cécile can truly say 'Je suis telle que tu m'as choisie,' and one day Jean flashes out in answer 'Est-ce qu'on peut jamais être assez certain de l'avenir de sa pensée pour prendre, en ces matières, des engagements éternels?' Cécile answers with the word 'Apostat.'

The final rupture takes place over their child's baptism. Jean does not wish to prevent it, but he declines to be present. Cécile then refuses to live with him and remains in her provincial home, whither she had gone for her child's birth, and he returns alone to Paris.

So the marriage comes to an end apparently. The implication is, of course, that religion is the separating cause, but it remains more than doubtful, to the reader's mind, whether natural divergences and antagonisms would not have done the work in any case. There were unquestionably enough of them to act as very efficient dissolvents.

Then follows, for Barois, a period of liberty and ecstatic enjoyment. The sense of freedom is intoxicating. 'Me voici libre,' he cries. 'J'ai brisé toutes les chaînes.' He gathers a band of like-minded friends about him, all young and enthusiastic; they start a journal, *Le Semeur*, devoted to the propagation of their ideas, and it leaps suddenly into fame. Before long *Le Semeur* espouses the cause of Dreyfus, and 'L'Affaire' fills the middle period in the life of Barois. It is a time of strenuous effort, of exultant energy, of high hopes. France, nay the world,—for what Frenchman but feels that the world moves when she does?—is to be regenerated by moral sentiments, nourished in the intellect and purified from all stain of superstition. 'Affranchisement, certitude, confiance passionnée en l'avenir,' these are the notes of the period.

But the *élan* and enthusiasm are not quite continuous.

Even in the first conversation, when the project of the journal is being talked over, suddenly, without apparent reason, a strange discouragement falls on the little band. 'Il plane une impalpable tristesse, un relent aigre d'enthousiasme refroidi.' The voice of the last excited speaker goes on with the same words, but the atmosphere has changed. 'Sa voix . . . a perdu son timbre triomphal, elle sombre dans le silence qui se renferme sur elle comme une eau morte.'

The scenes of these journalistic days lie in the Quartier Latin for the most part. We see one great brasserie in the Boulevard S. Michel where a table is reserved for the *Semeur* staff once a week. 'Rez-de-chaussée vaste et sombre—style Heidelberg' is the description. The table stands 'au ras du parquet sur le va-et-vient du boulevard.' The indescribable scent of the evening street comes to us. We can see the surging life of the Sorbonne and the art schools filling the pavements; we feel the youth, the movement, the *entrain* of it all. Jean lives in the Rue S. Jacques—somewhere in that great sweeping line that runs from the Panthéon to the river, where after dark the twinkling lights go swinging downwards in gleaming loops. The *Semeur* offices are in the statelier Rue de l'Université. Some of the friends live across the river 'en plein Marais.' We see them going to and fro, from S. Étienne du Mont, with its strange fantastic beauty, down the hill by S. Séverin, past Our Lady of Paris on her island, and everywhere their feet pass the church doors by, and they go with the eagerness of liberation.

But even in the enthusiastic enjoyment of that liberty, there remains a tinge of bitterness from the past. Barois speaks once of how he has felt 'ce religion s'infiltrer dans sa vie.' Someone has reproached him for intolerance towards Catholicism. He quivers into a reply that has a touch of fear. 'Maintenant je suis libre, mais depuis trop peu de temps encore pour être redevenu tolérant.' No. There can be no truce. In very self-defence he must be on the offensive against this religion whose insidious, pervading power he has felt.

Yet he does not always find himself in perfect accord with

his friends in their offensive. One of them writes an article violently attacking 'Pasteur, métaphysicien.' Barois protests. 'Tu oublies trop que notre matérialisme scientifique, c'est à ce spiritualiste impénitent que nous le devons.'

He is glad to leave speculative difficulties aside for action. 'L'Affaire Dreyfus' is his crusade, its business is his moral support, in it he finds his 'équilibre.' His courage and perseverance are astonishing. 'C'est une belle vie, sacredié, qu'une lutte pareille,' he cries, and again: 'La réalité . . . est laide, féroce, injuste, incohérente, mais quoi, c'est d'elle pourtant que la beauté finale jaillira un jour.'

When the 'Affaire' is ended at last, Barois is, as it were, on the crest of the wave. He gives a 'conférence' at the Trocadéro on 'L'avenir de l'Incroyance,' wherein he demonstrates to his own satisfaction, and that of an enormous and enthusiastic audience, that 'Le courant actuel est indiscutablement orienté vers une société sans Dieu.'

It is vividly real to us—that scene in the Trocadéro, and Barois' triumphant part in it. He is fresh from the battlefield, victory is in the very air around him. And he feels himself the prophet of the age. He will hold up the light of reason, clear and piercing, to illuminate the next stage of humanity's progress. He revels in the consciousness of enlightenment, of boundless courage. He looks to the coming time, the world that is to be, when the last illusions of superstition are purged away and the human intellect is lord of all.

Neither he nor his audience pause to consider whether the very enthusiasm that animates them does not spring from something in them besides the powers of intellect—something that they are leaving out of account in their system of things.

Dwelling on the future, Jean Barois is secure, proud, triumphant. When he glances behind him his mood changes. Towards the Church he shews no sign of such contemptuous charity as the victor might well feel for a conquered foe. His attitude even hints at the kind of antagonism that conceals a touch of fear. 'Hélas!' he says, 'l'homme que la religion a marqué dès son enfance

ne s'en débarrasse pas d'un simple mouvement de l'épaule, comme d'un vêtement usé. . . . La dissociation, lorsqu'elle est possible, est longue, irrégulière, souvent incomplète, toujours douleureuse.'

It is in the very bone and marrow of him, this subtle kind of possession, and the haunting fear it brings. It touches him with its cold fingers, ever so slightly, yet ever so unmistakably even here at the hour of his triumph.

Circumstances soon furnish an odd, suggestive commentary on his words. He just escapes being killed in a street accident. For one long moment he looks death in the face. Unconsciousness follows. When he comes to himself he begins mentally to reconstruct the episode. 'Curieux cette peur qu'on a de mourir,' he muses. 'C'est évidemment la seule sensation qui nous soit *totalement* nouvelle . . . personne n'a, dans son hérédité, la moindre expérience de ça. Et pourtant, un homme de science . . . doit se résigner.' Then, quite suddenly he remembers something else, something that had happened at the last moment. For a whole hour he lies thinking over it. Then he calls a friend who is in the room, and tells him. 'Au moment où j'ai vu que j'étais perdu, savez-vous ce que j'ai fait? Eh! bien, j'ai prié la Sainte Vierge. . . . Au moment-là, moi, Jean Barois, je n'ai pensé à rien d'autre, j'ai été souleve par un espoir fou, j'ai supplié de tout mon être la Sainte Vierge de faire un miracle. . . . Alors, vous comprenez, je suis hanté par l'idée que ça pourrait recommencer. Ce soir, cette nuit, est-ce que je sais maintenant.'

Then and there he writes a kind of Testament, a protest in advance against himself, against the tricks his nature may play him, when bodily or mental weakness disqualifies him from suppressing certain sides of himself in favour of the intellect. He is clearly conscious now of the meaning of the fears that have haunted him, and he tries to provide against their fulfilment in this way. He begins—'Ce que j'écris aujourd'hui . . . en pleine force . . . intellectuel . . . doit . . . prévaloir contre ce que je pourrai penser ou écrire à la fin de mon existence, lorsque je serai physiquement ou moralement diminué par l'âge ou par la maladie.' He

pursues his 'je ne crois pas' through a long series of statements, till he ends with 'Je suis certain que la science, en apprenant aux hommes à savoir ignorer, procurera à leurs consciences un équilibre qu'aucune foi n'a jamais su leur offrir.'

'Un équilibre'—That, after all, has been the lifelong quest of Jean Barois. He follows Truth very ardently, where he conceives her to lead, yet he is not quite one of those rare souls who follow her purely for her own sake. Had he been Catholic and saint he would hardly have risen to the height of St. Catherine of Genoa's cry—'Not Thine, but Thee.'

His strong, hungry individuality is always seeking for fuller self-realization, not finding it, as it is best found, by the way, on some diviner quest. He has, in a certain degree, found it in his outward life, in action, in the adventure of the 'affaire Dreyfus.' But an equilibrium stayed on outward circumstances may be lost, as they change. He wants to find it in his inner life, to establish it beyond the reach of outward circumstances—that is the imperative need of his soul.

And already there are not wanting indications that some surer standing must needs be found than even the triumphant vindication of Dreyfus, and all the heroic effort and aspiration that had gone to that.

The next division of *Jean Barois* is significantly called 'La Fêlure.' His life, we gather, is rather a sad one. He lives alone, he works very hard, he associates chiefly with his collaborators of the *Semeur*. Now that the vivid enthusiasm of the 'Affaire' days is over, life has grown rather grey. Presently we assist at a formal meeting of the staff of the *Semeur*, and we find that a profound discouragement is abroad amongst them. They review the work of their journal since its inception, they recall the hopes they had built upon it, and the degree of their fulfilment, now that they stand in the promised land of the ended 'Affaire Dreyfus.' One of them, Crestail, once the most enthusiastic and incurably romantic of the little band, now considers the situation. 'Nous avons crevé l'abcès,

nous comptions sur la guérison, et maintenant c'est la gangrène. En avons nous assez vu, la gabegie politique, les abus d'autorité, le mercantilisme partout, les spoliations anti-cléricales, le contre-sens anti-militariste. Enfin, la faillite générale.'

'Les spoliations anti-cléricales'—That is how Crestail and how Barois himself would describe the treatment of the Church by the State. But there were other members of the *Semeur* staff who thought differently. Divergences of view were beginning to shew, and to make themselves more and more felt. The old difference of opinion about the tone to be taken in writing of Pasteur had been a feather to shew which way the wind blew. Now the controversy is beginning to rend France in twain, and it cannot leave this little band of collaborators untouched.

Jean Barois, for his part, stands firm. Little as he loves the Church, he has no mind to see her persecuted. A conscientious principle of tolerance forbids that, to begin with. Moreover he is acute enough to foresee that in promoting such a line of action, the *Semeur* may well be sowing the seeds of a Catholic reaction. He has read too much history, doubtless, not to realize that the Church when oppressed and despoiled is ever at her purest and therefore at her strongest. But his attitude brings him into disfavour with a large section of his adherents.

His life is growing steadily sadder and lonelier.

A somewhat grim and melancholy love affair had brought a touch of sordid romance into his life for awhile. That dies out at last in circumstances that tend to embitter him, and to make him the more profoundly dissatisfied with the surroundings he has fashioned for himself. It had never been a great event in his life. Its ending leaves him only a little the poorer. But he is coming to a point where every little helps to make life look grey, and to rob it of its spring and energy.

For him, and for the friends he had cared for most, and with whom he had been in deepest sympathy, life seems closing in. They are no longer quite young, any of them; and seeing the fruits of their toil, their souls are unsatisfied.

Then a change comes over the life of Barois. His unknown, almost forgotten daughter expresses a wish to visit him. She spends some months under his roof, she gives him, for the first time in his life, a taste of peaceful, congenial domesticity. He is pathetically happy, pathetically afraid of losing her again. Then her religion is a revelation and an astonishment to him. He has never encountered anything like it before. She is not, as her mother had been, terrified and repelled by him. She shews him sympathy and respect, and to his amazement, she sets herself to read his books and his contributions to *Le Semeur*, makes a careful study of them all, and yet remains placid and undisturbed. His surprise and bewilderment are almost comic. He thinks, 'Vous ne me ferez pas croire que tout le labeur d'une vie comme la mienne, employée à combattre la religion, par les arguments précis, puisse se briser contre votre foi d'enfant.' But the confident certainty of her attitude disconcerts him. Moreover he cannot ignore the influence of her faith upon her life. 'C'est là que Marie trouve cette équilibre qui fait mon admiration depuis que je la vois vivre.' There is no denying that. Drawing near her, he finds that she stands that tremendous test to which the Christian must needs be liable. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' Marie's faith and her life justify each other. He could not, apparently, destroy her faith if he would. Presently he discovers a still stranger thing. He would not if he could. At first he had consulted with his friend, a veteran philosopher, Marc Élie Luce, as to the best way to influence Marie. After a while he writes to him. 'Elle m'est apparue façonnée par la religion et pour la religion. Devant un ensemble si fort, j'ai reculé. Une telle foi, c'est évidemment un mensonge, mais c'est aussi du bonheur humain.' He sees that the dogmatic system of the Church is to her as a frame, definite but spacious, within which she develops the inner life of the soul. 'Marie a ÉPROUVÉ le contact de Dieu,' she has reached a kind of certainty before which his reasonings are powerless. 'The least fact of an actual experience is proof against the strongest conclusion of mere speculation.' In spite of himself he feels the truth of that

saying. Then, as if he was thinking of that Testament of his, he asks himself, 'Dans combien d'années . . . la vérité scientifique donnera-t-elle apaisement total ? Jamais peut-être.' The time has gone by for Barois when he could despise that 'apaisement total.' He is beginning to yearn restlessly for it.

Then he discovers, with a great shock, that Marie intends to be a nun, that her visit to him had been planned as a test of her vocation. She reminds him that in entering a convent she hopes to be an offering for 'tous ceux qui vivent en faisant à Dieu la plus petite part possible, et de ceux qui ne lui en font pas du tout.'

Then comes a bad illness, in which Marie nurses him. A time of broken health and of depression follows. There is a timid, constrained resumption of intercourse with his wife. About the same time one of his old friends commits suicide in a mysterious tragical fashion—apparently in sheer despair of life. 'Que la vie est triste.'

Jean Barois is falling out of touch with his generation. We are given two interviews between him and the young world that is growing up around him. The first is with a youthful atheist, as far in advance, in his own eyes, of Barois' position, as Barois used to feel in advance of his wife and her confessor. Barois is disgusted and repelled when young Dalier proclaims placidly 'Chez moi l'athéisme est inné. Mon père, mon grand-père étaient athées.' Barois tries to plead the cause of the 'sentiment religieux,' which in his opinion is innate in man, and survives the destruction of dogmatic belief. Dalier's cool contempt for what he considers an old-fashioned superstition stings the elder man in spite of himself.

As Dalier goes out, two other young men enter. They too are ultra modern, but of another school. They call themselves nationalists, classicists, democrats. They seem to Barois to hold a mass of irreconcilable principles, which yet reconcile themselves well enough in the clear-cut theories they pronounce. Suddenly he stumbles on a startling fact. Both are practising Catholics. He stands amazed. Then 'avec une angoisse soudaine' he asks: 'Répondez-moi

loyalement, Messieurs, est-ce que vraiment aujourd'hui la grande majorité des jeunes gens est Catholique ?' They answer in the affirmative, and Barois is overcome with astonishment. He questions them, seeking some explanation, and finds that every circumstance, every surrounding that was thought to make faith impossible in his day, has apparently acted in a precisely contrary manner upon these lads. He is utterly out of sympathy with their standpoint, their patronizing attitude provokes him, but there they stand, representatives, fairly enough chosen, of 'les jeunes gens.' He and his friends have spent the best years of their lives in opening the way to untrammelled freedom of thought for the rising generation. And this is the end—this or Dalier. He tells them impatiently that they represent a reaction 'un affaiblissement de la pensée française, qui a besoin de repos peut-être, pour avoir trop longtemps de suite poussé sa pointe dans l'inconnu.' And so he bows them out.

But his time is come, and he knows it. He resigns his post as editor of the *Semeur*. He feels himself unfit for it. 'L'entrain n'y est plus.' To Marc Élie Luce he explains himself. It is a case of 'Mut verloren, alles verloren.' He has lost courage, hope for the future, trust in the leadings of the intellect. Death is approaching, and contrary to all his principles he regards it with dread. 'Je ne peux pas me résigner à ce néant.' Luce is a calm, self-contained kind of person. 'Il est si facile,' he says wonderingly, 'de ne chercher notre bonheur que dans les satisfactions de la raison.' 'Elles ne me suffisent plus,' answers Barois briefly.

Marie enters her convent, and the desolate father and mother draw together instinctively, like dumb creatures seeking mutual warmth in a storm. They set up house in the old home, but Jean's bodily condition grows rapidly worse. Consumption, the old enemy of his childhood, develops. He is tortured by doubts of his doubts, by an appalling mental unrest.

Then follows a strange episode. He falls in with a priest, the director of his wife's good works, in whom he

finds a wider intellect, a deeper sympathy, than has come his way before, in Christian form. By a strange chance this very priest is himself tortured by doubts, has suffered in that way for years, and the realization of Barois' state affects him deeply. We see a rough journal of their intercourse. The Abbé Levys writes : ' Pourquoi faut-il que le prêtre, appelé à guider cet athée vers Dieu, soit un pauvre tourmenté que les doutes ravagent ? Peut-être suis-je mieux préparé qu'un autre à soigner cette plaie. . . . Je ferais en sorte qu'il ne soupçonne jamais de quelles mains tremblantes . . . je lui apporte ce Dieu qu'il cherche.'

It is a strange agony of two human souls : Barois, who doubts equally Faith itself and scepticism, and doubts with terror and anguish ; and the Abbé, now wrestling with the sufferer's misery, all priest, then shrinking before the fear of treason to the intellect. In this struggle the priest finds himself welded again to his functions and his calling, bound anew to the Church. He recognizes the limitations of the intellect. Perhaps it is the supreme moment of the book, when, bending over the dying man, the Abbé cries ' Moi, prêtre, je ne puis vous apporter que des raisonnements. Mais Dieu peut vous toucher de sa grâce.'

At last comes the long-deferred day when the flood-gates are down, ' apaisement,' peace, joy, in what is left of Jean Barois. His friend Luce visits him, and views him with dismay. ' Il est méconnaissable. Il ne reste plus rien de son intelligence.' He has no comprehension of what has been passing in the soul of Barois, of the long process of which this conversion is the outcome, or of the real bearing and trend of the mental qualities of his friend, the qualities that had seemed to be the bond between them. Luce himself is prepared to face annihilation with a placid courage that reminds one of Dr. Johnson's definition of his own disregard of danger as ' stark insensibility.'

Afterwards we have two death scenes. We are told how Marc Élie Luce dies, ' en philosophe,' thinking of himself as a second Socrates, entirely self-satisfied. ' Mon sort,' he says, ' a été celui d'un pommier de bonne terre, qui porte régulièrement ses fruits.' He expects and desires no more

future than the apple-tree when it is cut down and withered.

In contrast we have the death of Barois, a sad scene enough of bodily and mental suffering. His newly found faith in an untried weapon, sometimes as much a fear as a hope. Doubt and horror catch him by the throat even at the last.

When he lies dead his wife finds the old Protest written in self-defence that day when in the fear of death he had found himself beginning 'Je vous salue, Marie.' Cécile reads the document with horror. She never doubts the necessity for its destruction. Its publication would spoil all the effect of his conversion, and indeed she honestly looks on it as revoked thereby. She burns it. One hopes Marie would not have done that, but it is an action eminently characteristic of Cécile. The Abbé Levys puts out no hand to check her. 'Il pense à l'Église, qui a su alléger ce départ, et à qui le sacrifice est dû—peut-être.'

So the story ends, on a note of cynicism and questioning. But for Jean Barois the tide has come in at last.

The film is run out, and the lights die down. As their glare fades, the familiar Paris streets emerge into the light of common day. What a different Paris from the one Jean Barois knew! The Boulevard S. Michel no longer echoes as it used to do, to the sound of feet. The Sorbonne and the Ateliers have poured out their floods of eager young life in another direction. And the inner life of France is altering too, as the life of Jean Barois may help us to understand. The orientation is changed, but not as he once thought, towards a society without God. For they tell us who know, that in this hour of death and day of judgement God is coming to His Own. *Ainsi soit-il!*

H. Grierson.

Art. VII.—THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND STATE.

1. *Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State.* (London: S.P.C.K. 1916.)
2. *Archbishops' Committee on Church and State, Summary of Proposals of the Report.* (London: S.P.C.K. 1916.)

There are not many thinking Englishmen who would not allow that the efficiency of the Church of England is a matter of concern to the nation, even if they themselves reject it or disregard its claims. Nor are there many who have inquired into the subject who will dispute that the efficiency of the Church is in fact impaired by the constitutional and legal conditions under which it works. It would therefore, we think, be a great misfortune if the supreme demands of the war on the energy and attention of us all were to prevent the due consideration of the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State; for it is the object of the Report to propose remedies for defects and mischiefs in the present legal situation of the Church, or in other words in the relation between the English Church and the English State.

Now the defects and mischiefs to which the Committee call attention are in their main outlines familiar enough to Churchmen, and in particular to readers of this Review. They spring ultimately from one cause, namely that Parliament, which down to times comparatively recent was tolerably representative of the laity of the Church, is now to a great extent composed of those who expressly deny the claim of the Church and reject its teaching and discipline. We have pointed out before in this Review that this change, none the less fundamental that it has been gradual, has produced a situation which no one would have deliberately created and scarcely any one would deliberately defend. Nothing is more familiar to readers of history than controversy between Church and State. Ever since

Christianity was recognized by the Roman Emperors the boundaries which separate their domains have been more or less in dispute. The Church has a double aspect. On the one hand it is the Church of God, the Body of Christ: on the other it is a society of men and women with complex relations to the world of secular business. And its relation to the nation, to the men and women of the country in which it is, is likewise double. So many of them as are its living members have that part in its internal government legislative and executive which belongs to them according to its law. And on the other hand the State, considered as the organization of men in their secular character, both of those who are living members of the Church and of any who are not, has the same right of general control over the Church that it has over any other society within the realm. The two things are essentially distinct. A Churchman exercises rights of the first class as a Churchman and by no other title: those of the second class, not as a Churchman at all, but as having such share as the constitution of the country allows him in the power which in secular matters is supreme over the Church, as over all societies of its citizens. And therefore it is a mere confusion and usurpation when those who deny the Church's title and repudiate its jurisdiction claim that part in its government which belongs to its own laity as if it were their right as members of the State. Yet this is exactly what is claimed for the Parliament of the United Kingdom in regard to the Church of England. Parliament is not satisfied with legislating from outside either for or against the Church, with oppressing it or protecting it or helping it as the legislature of a pagan state might do. It claims a voice (and the only effective voice) in the legislation of the Church as to its own domestic concerns, for example the formulation of its doctrines, the ordering of its worship, the arrangement of its dioceses. No jot or tittle of the rubrics of the Prayer Book or of the Articles of Religion can be altered except by Parliament. No diocese can be divided, although the necessary funds have been wholly supplied by the private liberality of Churchmen, except by the same authority. And the result

is not merely that the Church has an unsatisfactory legislature, or one with a defective title : it has in effect no legislature at all. For the House of Commons as it now is will scarcely be persuaded to pass any measure whatever of Church legislation ; partly because a considerable number of the members are more or less hostile to the Church and for that and other reasons dislike helping it ; and partly because all are aware that the House is very ill qualified for the discussion of Church matters, and that more harm than good is likely to be done by attempting to discuss them there.[1]

This is in fact the situation ; and no one will suggest that any living and active society can long be content to remain wholly dependent for the power to make even trifling changes in its laws and rules upon an outside and in part unfriendly body, a body moreover which can only with the utmost difficulty be induced to attend to its affairs at all. The position is well summed up towards the end of the excellent historical sketch by Sir Lewis Dibdin and the present Master of Balliol which forms the second section of the Report before us : 'the constitution of Parliament prevents its being in any true sense representative of the Church, and the experience of recent years

[1] Mr. Douglas Eyre, in a memorandum appended to the Report (p. 69), gives it as his opinion that the House of Commons has been hostile or indifferent to Church legislation because it has not been sufficiently drastic. He says 'The House naturally objects to its time being taken up with the consideration of tinkering measures. In the course, for instance, of the debate on the Benefices Bill (1898) the main criticism on the Bill related to its inadequacy. Its promoters were plainly told that a measure which really struck at the root of the abuses with which it was concerned would have received support from all parts of the House.' We are well aware that statements of this sort were made by opponents of that bill, but we are, we confess, surprised that anyone should be so simple as to be taken in by them. The fact is that the gentlemen in question would have opposed the bill, whatever had been its provisions, because it was a Church bill. The complaint that it was 'tinkering' was simply a handy stick to beat it with ; if the bill had been different no doubt there would have been a different stick, but the beating would have been equally vigorous.

has shewn that it possesses neither time nor inclination nor knowledge for dealing with ecclesiastical affairs.'[1]

It was to devise some remedy for this state of things that the Committee whose Report we are considering was appointed by the Archbishops at the request (practically unanimous) of the Representative Church Council. The problem, as the Committee have understood it, is how to give the Church that liberty which any society must have if it is to be efficient, and at the same time to preserve to the State the ultimate control which has always been claimed by the sovereign secular power in England, and which it was one of the objects of the Reformation to define and secure.

The names of those who served on the Committee and signed the Report are at the beginning of the volume. We shall have to mention its composition again, in view of criticisms which have been passed upon it. In the meantime we will only say that the names shew at least this, that anything on which the members of the Committee were substantially agreed deserves serious and respectful consideration.

The volume before us is full of interesting and valuable matter, but we propose in the present Article to limit ourselves to the Report proper, explaining shortly its scope, and avoiding for the most part the examination of details. We think however that the Committee have done wisely to formulate exactly and minutely the scheme which they recommend. There is no better test of a scheme (short of actually working it) than to reduce it to the form of a complete enactment, for in the process many difficulties arise and are overcome which are not even perceived so long as the matter is considered only as one of theory or principle.

Before giving an outline of the proposals of the Committee we should mention that they held themselves precluded by the terms of the reference to them from considering what is called disestablishment: they addressed themselves to 'the problem of how to secure a due measure of spiritual independence on the basis of establishment.'[2] We have certainly no intention of converting this Article into a dis-

[1] P. 26. [2] P. 39.

sertation on 'establishment,' but we will record once more our conviction that the hopes entertained by many Churchmen of benefits to be derived from disestablishment are for the most part quite illusory, and are entertained because those who entertain them have not thought out what is the real meaning of a very loose word, or what would really be the result of the change which they advocate; and that such benefits as would or might be derived from it can perfectly well, and indeed in a better form, be obtained without it. In truth far the most substantial of the advantages to be hoped for from 'disestablishment' is the recovery to the Church of legislative power. The causes which have paralyzed this have no necessary connexion with 'establishment,' and had no existence during many centuries in which the Church was at least as fully 'established' as it is now; and accordingly the Report before us has no difficulty in shewing that it can be revived without in any way infringing the due prerogatives of the State.

The Committee sum up their proposals in the following words: 'to give to the Church the right to legislate, and at the same time to provide a means by which full powers of scrutiny, criticism, and veto, are reserved to the State,'[1] and thus the scheme divides itself under two heads: legislation by the Church, control of that legislation by the State.

The legislature, the organ by which the Church legislates, is to be a 'Church Council' 'thoroughly representative of all forms and classes of Church opinion.' It is to consist of three Houses, of Bishops, Clergy, and Laymen, respectively.

The House of Bishops is to consist of all diocesan bishops of the Provinces of Canterbury and York.

The House of Clergy is to consist of (*a*) two representatives of each archdeaconry, unbeneficed priests duly authorized to officiate having an equal right both to vote and to be elected with the beneficed; (*b*) one representative of each Cathedral chapter, the dean being eligible but not *ex officio* a member of the House; (*c*) the archdeacons

[1] P. 39.

ex officio. This differs from the present constitution of the Lower Houses of Convocation in three respects : unbeneficed priests are on a level with beneficed ; the number of representatives of the general body of the clergy is increased by the direct representation of each archdeaconry (as now in the Province of York) ; deans are not *ex officio* members.

The constitution of the House of Laymen is naturally more complicated. It is based on a roll of electors for each ecclesiastical parish, the electors being adult residents of either sex who are communicants, or (if not actually communicants) have been baptized and confirmed and are admissible to communion, and do not belong to any religious body not in communion with the Church. Provision is made by which a person who ordinarily attends the church of a parish other than his own may be on the roll for the parish in which he usually worships.

Those who are on the roll are to elect annually a Parochial Council, of which the churchwardens if communicants are also to be members.

The Parochial Council is to elect annually lay representatives for the Ruridecanal Conference (if there is one), and for the Diocesan Conference.[1]

The House of Laymen itself is to be elected triennially by the lay representatives in the several Diocesan Conferences in proportion to the population of the dioceses, and the Committee propose in addition special representatives of ' wage-earners ' and ' students.'

All representatives on Councils and Conferences must be actual communicants. Women are not to be eligible except for the Parochial Councils.

In their scheme of lay representation the Committee have followed, with some modifications, the Report on the Representation of the Laity which after ' exhaustive consideration ' was adopted by the Representative Church Council just before the beginning of the war.

[1] It is contemplated that in some large dioceses the lay members of the Diocesan Conference shall be elected by the lay members of the Ruridecanal Conference and not directly by the Parochial Councils.

The legislative power which it is proposed to confer upon the Church Council, and which includes the repeal or amendment of Acts of Parliament, is (apart from the control of the State to which we will come presently) to be exercised subject to certain conditions :

1. All measures must be passed by each of the three Houses.

2. Any alteration of the ' Constitution ' of the Council must be passed in each House by a majority consisting of two thirds of those present.

3. Any measure ' touching doctrinal formulae or the services or ceremonies of the Church or the administration of the sacraments or sacred rites thereof ' must be initiated in the House of Bishops, and must be either passed or rejected entire in the terms in which it is finally proposed by that House.

Apart from legislation, the Council are not to ' issue any statement purporting to define the doctrine of the Church of England on any question of theology.'

We should add that it is proposed to make it obligatory upon the Church Council to bring forward, as soon as they are legally constituted, a measure for conferring definite administrative powers upon the Parochial Councils.

We pass now to the machinery proposed for securing to the State control over the legislation of the Church Council. That the control proposed is not necessarily involved in ' establishment ' is shewn, as the Report points out, by the example of the Established Church of Scotland, which enjoys much more freedom ; but we think that the Committee have judged rightly that the history of the Church of England both before and after the Reformation makes it reasonable that such a control should be kept, and moreover that there is nothing in it inconsistent with the office and mission of the Church as it has been understood either in this country or elsewhere. It has also the great advantage that the concession to the State of a veto makes it unnecessary to attempt the difficult and hazardous task of formally limiting the area of the Church's legislative power.

The proposal is as follows. There is to be an 'Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council' appointed by the Crown, to which every measure passed by the Church Council is to be submitted by the 'Legislative Committee' of the Council. The Privy Council Committee, after considering any explanations offered by the Church Council Committee, and (if they think fit) conferring with them, are to report to His Majesty whether or not the measure should receive the Royal Assent, giving their reasons. The Report is not to be presented until the Church Council Committee so desire, and the Church Council Committee may withdraw a measure from further consideration at any time before the Privy Council Committee's Report has been actually presented. The Report when presented is to be laid (with the text of the measure) before Parliament.

If the Privy Council Committee report in favour of the measure, it goes, unless either House of Parliament within forty days direct to the contrary, to the King, and on receiving the Royal Assent becomes law.

If the Privy Council Committee report against the measure, it drops, unless both Houses of Parliament direct that it be submitted for the Royal Assent.

The suggestion of the Archbishops' Committee is that a scheme such as that of which we have given a bare summary should, when finally settled, be presented (with the necessary permission) by the Convocations to the Crown, and laid by the Crown before Parliament. Parliament is then to be asked to pass the necessary Statute. If this were done, the scheme would have the full constitutional authority both of Church and State.[1]

The scheme appears to us, generally and leaving aside some disputable details, to be satisfactory and practicable. Full power of legislation on Church matters by a body adequately representative of clergy and laity, careful provision against ill considered action, a veto by the State, but a veto which can only be exercised after the measure has been really considered—this is the sum of it; and we cannot doubt

[1] The texts of the proposed 'Constitution' and Act of Parliament are printed with the Committee's Report.

that it would effect an immense improvement of our present condition, and would remove what is not only a serious practical evil but also a cause of just offence to all who regard the Church as a living and working body, whose life is given, and whose work is appointed, by God.

It may be asked what is the difference between obliging the Church to go to Parliament for legislation and giving Parliament a veto on legislation which the Church has passed. In one sense there is no difference. In either case Parliament has the final voice, as indeed it has, so far as law goes, as to all matters whether secular or sacred, and whether they relate to an 'established' Church or to any other religious community. But in practice there is all the difference in the world. Under the present system nothing can be done until a bill has passed through all the stages in both Houses of Parliament, and, as things are now and have been for many years, this means that it is in the power of a handful of members, or even of one, to stop it. On the other hand under the Committee's scheme the measure, if passed by the representative assembly of the Church and approved by a responsible Committee after a real consideration of it on its merits, goes through automatically unless someone takes the definite step of challenging it in Parliament, and one of the Houses of Parliament by a deliberate vote supports his objection. The right of either House of Parliament to forbid a particular piece of Church legislation if it so wishes is preserved absolutely, but Church legislation will no longer be prevented merely because the House of Commons has not the time or desire to consider it.

The criticisms which we have seen on the Committee's proposals come from two opposite directions. Examples of the one class are a letter by Dr. Rashdall in *The Spectator* of August 5, 1916, and an article by the Dean of Durham in the *Edinburgh Review* for October last. Dr. Rashdall's beginning is fair enough :

'I should not myself be disposed to deny the general proposition that the Church of England does want, subject to the

controlling power of Parliament, some means of dealing with its own formularies and with the details of its internal administration, and that such means can only be found in the creation of some such body as the Committee's report recommends. But the details of the scheme seem to be open to the gravest criticism.'

The details to which he objects are (1) the period during which a favourable report of the 'Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council' is to lie on the tables of the Houses of Parliament. He thinks the forty days proposed too short. (2) The Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council. He anticipates that this will consist of 'a very ecclesiastically and conservatively minded body of elderly lawyers and others' appointed through 'subterranean influences' and representing 'the mind of some bishop who has the ear of the Minister.' (3) That deans are not to be *ex officio* members of the House of Clergy. The rest of Dr. Rashdall's objections are not to what the Archbishops' Committee have proposed, but to what he fears that the representative body which he agrees should be set up may approve. Of the three specific criticisms which he makes on the scheme itself, two, the first and the third, relate to matters of detail which are obviously fair subjects for discussion. They certainly do not seem to afford any ground for the vehemence with which Dr. Rashdall writes. The second is an example of the strange perversity of suspicion which appears to darken Dr. Rashdall's outlook on ecclesiastical affairs. Why he should suppose that the Government which appoints the Ecclesiastical Committee would act in the way which he describes we are quite unable to imagine. A like comment may be made on his criticism of the composition of the Archbishops' Committee. Dr. Rashdall 'echoes' a complaint made by *The Spectator* that the Committee contained too many 'High Churchmen' and no 'Broad Churchmen.' The names speak for themselves. We should have thought that the conclusion of *The Spectator* and Dr. Rashdall could only be reached by taking the word 'high' in an exceedingly wide sense and the word 'broad' in an exceedingly restricted sense—a very familiar controversial device of the partisan

who always identifies everyone who does not exactly agree with him with the opposite party. The result of these inflammatory topics is that by the end of Dr. Rashdall's letter the scheme, to the principle of which he began by subscribing, has become 'these insidious proposals.'

Nevertheless we should not altogether despair of mollifying Dr. Rashdall if we should be so fortunate as to catch him in a placid mood; for he does appear to recognize that things cannot long remain as they are, and moreover that the Church of England is a real thing and not a mere phrase. We could scarcely venture to entertain any such hope of the Dean of Durham. In the Dean's view the Church of England has really no existence as a living working organism. To talk of the Church means to him no more than to recognize that the moral standards of the State and people of England have been formed under the influence direct and indirect of Christianity. The nation is the 'Christian Society,' in other words the Church; and accordingly the Dean is quite prepared to see in Parliament the 'true organ' of its 'corporate witness.' On such principles it is plain that the difficulties which were the occasion of the appointment of the Archbishops' Committee simply do not exist. Parliament is a perfectly satisfactory representative of the Church, because it represents the nation, which is the 'Christian Society.' It is pertinent to remark that many of the members themselves by no means take this view of the Church of England. Those of them who are Roman Catholics regard the Church of England as a pretentious imposture; those who are protestant nonconformists regard it as so erroneous in faith or practice or both that they cannot conscientiously conform to it. We say nothing of those who reject Christianity altogether. None of these things trouble the Dean of Durham. All alike are fit to compose the only legislature for matters affecting the law and organization of the Church, if indeed he conceives of the Church as having, or as capable of having, either law or organization. Such a position as this has no relation to the world of fact. We all know that the Church of England has a meaning, that it does really work and live,

that it is not a mere way of describing the nation ; and indeed if it were no more than what the Dean seems to think it is, no one would exert himself to maintain or defend it, for there would be in reality nothing to maintain or defend. The truth is that the Dean confuses two totally distinct things. It is quite true that every baptized English person has a right to the ministrations of the Church, to share in its rites and ceremonies, if he fulfils such conditions as are appointed by its law ; and is in that sense a member of the English Church. In more technical language, ecclesiastical law knows nothing of nonconformity, whether Roman or protestant. But it is quite a different thing to say that those who could conform to the Church and do not, who reject or neglect its ordinances, are entitled to an active voice in the ordering of its affairs. It is no question of 'narrowing the Church.' The Church refuses no one : everyone is entitled to what the Church has to give : but he must ask for it, and he must comply with the conditions of receiving it. And till by doing so he acknowledges the Church, and becomes in reality as well as in theory a member of it, it is absurd that he should claim to represent it.

The criticisms of the other class come from those who regret that the Committee have conceded any veto to Parliament, and would claim for the Church Council complete and independent legislative power. There is of course much to be said for this as a matter of theory. But we think it is a sufficient answer that what is proposed by the Committee is certainly not more than has been yielded to the secular power by the Church in many and diverse ages and countries ; and that it would be folly, by insisting on that which is impracticable (even if it were expedient), to throw away a chance of obtaining what would be a most substantial measure of release from fetters which grievously impede the Church's work.

There is criticism of another type which is really not so much criticism of the Committee's proposals as of the Church itself. Many ardent Churchmen have long chafed at the caution of Church dignitaries and Church assemblies, and

they fear that the new Council would be equally timid. The obvious answer is that the object of creating a Church legislature is to represent the deliberate opinion of Churchmen, not to override it. That opinion may be mistaken, but the remedy is not to refuse to give it expression but to endeavour to change it. If the proposed Council is not truly representative it should be made so. But if it does adequately represent the Church, then the Committee are justified in saying that if their plan should prove to be conservative it is because those whose opinions they make effective are themselves conservative.

We have not however on the present occasion to discuss either how the Church would be likely to use legislative power, or how it ought to use it. The question which chiefly engaged the attention of the Archbishops' Committee was simply by what method and in what form it can best be restored; and no one who in any sense believes in the Church could refuse to allow it such power from fear lest it be misused.

Art. VIII.—THE WAR: A NEW CRISIS.

1. *Imperial Germany.* By Prince von Bülow. With a Foreword by J. W. Headlam. Translation by Marie Lewenz, M.A. New and Revised Edition. (London: Cassell and Company Ltd. 1916.)
2. *Belgischer Aktenstücke* 1905–1914. Berichte der Belgischen Vertreter in Berlin, London und Paris, an den Minister des Aeusseren in Brüssel. Herausgegeben vom auswärtigen Amt. (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn.)
3. *Central Europe.* By Friedrich Naumann, Member of the Reichstag. With an Introduction by W. J. Ashley. Translated by Christabel M. Meredith. (London: P. S. King and Son, Ltd. 1916.)

4. *The Issue.* By J. W. HEADLAM, M.A. Author of '*The Life of Bismarck*,' '*The History of Twelve Days*,' etc. (London: Constable and Co. Ltd. 1917.)
5. *Here and there in the War Area.* By the Right Rev. HERBERT BURY, D.D., Bishop for North and Central Europe. (London and Oxford: A. R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd. 1916.)
6. *Political Frontiers and Boundary Making.* By Colonel SIR THOMAS HOLDICH, K.C.M.G., etc. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 1916.)
7. *The Soul of Russia.* Edited by WINIFRED STEPHENS. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 1916.)
8. *In View of the End.* A Retrospect and a Prospect. By W. SANDAY, D.D., F.B.A. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1916.)
9. *The Present Crisis in our Nation's Life.* A Sermon preached in St. Paul's Chapel, Trinity Parish, New York. By the Rector WILLIAM THOMAS MANNING, S.T.D., at the celebration of the 150th Anniversary of the opening of St. Paul's Chapel on Monday, October 30, 1916. (Published by Request.)
10. *The Need of an Organised Application of Tropical Hygiene to prevent Excessive Wastage from Disease in our Armies in the East.* By W. J. SIMPSON, C.M.G., M.D., F.R.C.P., Professor of Hygiene and Public Health in the University of London, King's College. (*Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, December 1, 1916.)

Two books recently published in Germany and now translated are most illuminating on the designs and intentions of that country. The one is the new edition of the work of Prince von Bülow on German politics. It was published first in 1913, and is largely an account and justification of the administration of the German Empire from 1897 to 1909. A revised edition has recently appeared in Germany with considerable alterations and additions and the English translation by Miss Lewenz has an admirable introduction by Mr. J. W. Headlam. The other is Friedrich Naumann's

work on *Mitteleuropa*, a translation of which, with an introduction by Professor Ashley, has now been issued.

I

The most interesting point for us in Prince von Bülow's book is his account of the aims and purposes of Germany during the ten to fifteen years before the war. It is well known that the Germans claim that the whole development of their navy and the further development of their army have been rendered necessary by self-defence; that they found themselves surrounded by hostile nations; and in particular that King Edward VII had adopted a policy of isolating Germany with a view to being able to crush it; and that therefore they had been compelled against their will to develop their military and naval powers. In support of this they have published a series of diplomatic papers which they discovered in Belgium containing the dispatches written home to the Minister of Foreign Affairs by the Belgian representatives at Berlin, London and Paris. These undoubtedly seem at first sight to support this contention. They were written just at the time when King Edward was undoubtedly strengthening the position of England by friendly arrangements with various Continental powers. The theme is that England is filled with commercial jealousy of Germany; that for this reason it is trying to strengthen its position and pretending that it is compelled to do so by the military development and aims of Germany. The Belgian Ministers consider that this suspicion is unfounded. Germany has all it wants, and does not desire anything more; and this action on the part of England will be dangerous to the peace of Europe.

Our English point of view is that so far as regards German trade development we were quite prepared to meet it commercially, and that our alliances and preparations were made because we felt that the increasing power of Germany was becoming dangerous to the peace and liberty of Europe.[1]

[1] On the question of commercial rivalry see Dr. Sanday's admirable pamphlet *In View of the End*, p. 17.

We have now Prince von Bülow's description of what was the political intention of Germany, and he tells us quite definitely that it was a struggle for world-power.

'The path of world politics lay open to Germany too, when she had won a powerful position on a level with the older Great Powers. The question was whether we should tread that new path [risk the "grand game," as Disraeli used to call world politics], or whether we should hesitate to undertake further hazardous enterprises for fear of compromising our newly acquired power.

'In the Emperor William II the nation found a clear-sighted, strong-willed guide, who led them along the new road. With him we trod the path of world politics; but not as conquerors, not amid adventures and quarrels. We advanced slowly, and our rate of progress was regulated, not by the impatience of ambition, but by the interests we had to promote and the rights we had to assert. We did not plunge into world politics, we grew, so to speak, into our task in that sphere, and we did not exchange the old European policy of Prussia and Germany for the new world policy.'

This does not look like the language of a people who are satiated with what they have got. It clearly implies that they meant to advance to something very much further. In order to do this, what was necessary was the creation of a fleet. But, as Prince von Bülow says, that was quite naturally something which might raise the suspicions of England. Therefore, he tells us, definitely and distinctly, that the aim of his policy was to keep on friendly but not too friendly terms with England until the fleet was strong enough to make their position safe. And he defends very elaborately the steps that they had taken.

'[Our fleet had to be made so strong, and must in future remain so strong, that naval warfare with us is fraught with danger which will imperil the superiority of even the mightiest Sea Power.'][1]

He goes on to discuss the suggestion which had been

[1] The passages in Bülow's book in square brackets were added in the second edition.

made that England should have attacked Germany while she was making her fleet, and admits that such action would have been quite justified.

'[While our fleet was in process of construction a preventive war] against Germany was repeatedly demanded in England. The Civil Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. Arthur Lee, asserted in a public speech on February 3, 1905, that attention should be directed to the North Sea. . . . The *Daily Chronicle* emphasized this utterance with the words: "If the German fleet had been smashed in October 1904, we should have had peace in Europe for sixty years. For this reason we consider the statement Mr. Arthur Lee uttered, assuming that it was on behalf of the Cabinet, a wise and pacific declaration of the unalterable purpose of the Mistress of the Seas."'

And on this he comments:

'England had discovered the distressing fact that in spite of all her plans for isolating us, she had missed the right moment for crushing the rival she feared.'

It is quite true that Prince von Bülow says that the object of this development was entirely peaceful.

'We were concerned with the acquirement of means of defence, not of attack.'

'By protecting this weak point, and also rendering a naval attack on the Empire an undertaking of great risk for the enemy, we preserved not only the peace of our own country, but also that of Europe.'

'Just as the army prevented any wanton interruption of the course of Germany's Continental policy, so the navy prevented any interruption in the development of our world policy.'

It is true, then, that Prince von Bülow asserts that the only object of the navy, as of the army, was defence, and that it led to the promotion of peace; but he goes on to say that that meant that the development of Germany's world policy should go on without interruption. It is, of course, only from the German point of view that these two statements are not inconsistent; but an analysis at one particular juncture will enable us to see exactly what Prince von Bülow's policy means. He looks upon the annexation

of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria without a European war as one of his greatest diplomatic triumphs. Now what happened on that occasion? Suddenly, without any warning to the Powers, Austria announced the annexation of the two protected countries of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This was contrary to the treaties under which she held them, and was clearly a breach of international agreement. At once Bülow made up his mind that he would support his ally. It gradually became apparent that at that time the Entente of Russia, France and England were not prepared to fight, and therefore, as 'the German sword was thrown into the scale of European decision,' Bülow claims that he was enabled to preserve peace.

☞ 'The Belgian Minister in Berlin [Baron Greindl] summed up the results of this diplomatic campaign by which we secured a considerable victory, while at the same time the peace of the world remained undisturbed, "... Germany alone secured the maintenance of peace."'

Now in a sense this may be true; but peace was secured simply by Germany obtaining what she wanted; and what was called a defensive policy was defensive, not of her own country against foreign attacks, but of her designs on the world for increasing her empire against the opposition of those who would suffer by it. It was a clear and definite warning to the rest of Europe that, if Germany was sufficiently strong, she would extend her power just as she felt inclined, and that the consideration of other peoples' or countries' rights would not weigh with her at all. The alternative was put before the rest of Europe of submitting to Berlin's claims or of fighting. That has always been before Europe ever since. It happened, of course, during the Balkan War, but again Russia, and no doubt ourselves, preferred to avoid war if we could. It would be difficult to fight for the right of the Montenegrins to occupy and hold Scutari, although fundamental questions were really involved in that. It was when Austria, supported by Germany, presented an ultimatum to Serbia which would for all practical purposes have destroyed the independence of

that country that Europe felt that this so-called peaceful and defensive policy could no longer be endured. We do not think that anyone can read Prince von Bülow's work without seeing that Germany has been deliberately increasing its army and its navy with the definite object of increasing its empire at the expense of other nations; that King Edward was entirely justified in his action of bringing about a series of defensive arrangements with different countries on the Continent; and that as soon as Germany embarked on that policy which would eventually interfere with the interests and rights of other countries a war between them and ourselves and our allies was inevitable. This was the necessary result of the aggressive policy which Germany has undertaken.

II

Equally illuminating as regards the future policy of Germany is Friedrich Naumann's work, translated under the title *Central Europe*. It does not of course describe a policy formally adopted, but it represents undoubtedly the aims of many German politicians, and there are many indications that as soon as the favourable moment arrives it will in fact become the official policy of the Government. It shews the tendency and the thoughts of Germany, or a large section of Germany, very well.

We think what becomes quite clear is that the German nation has been studying statistics with very great care, and has begun to be depressed by the small number of persons in the German Empire compared with those in others. It reads how there are four States with over 100,000,000 people—Great Britain, China, Russia and the United States; whereas Germany comes only in the second rank, and has a smaller population in its Empire even than France including the Colonies.

The thesis maintained is that after the war we shall all be divided from one another by trenches. There will be a big trench on the east of Germany, and another big trench on the west of Germany; and the primary question is, where this trench goes, and in particular whether there

is to be a trench between Germany and Austria. As the unity in arms of the German peoples in 1870 led to the modern German Empire, so the unity in arms between Germany and Austria must lead to a solidarity between those two countries. Upon what basis is this to be built? Clearly, they must both preserve a good deal of their national characteristics. They represent different methods of government and policy. But unless the alliance of Germany and Austria can be a strong one, neither of them will be able to stand up alone against their neighbours. Therefore there is to be created what is now called a Super-State of Central Europe. To begin with, this is to be based upon Germany and Austria and Hungary, but Naumann looks forward to its influence being extended much further: in fact, it is hoped that all the smaller countries—Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Roumania, the Balkan peoples and Turkey—will ultimately come in. The various States making this Super-State are to be independent in education, and in religion and in their constitutions, but they are to be united together by their military and economic system.

There is a great deal of interest and importance said about respect for other races. 'We must learn better than before to separate off that coercion and law, which are State necessities, from those things in which free play may be allowed to individual tendencies.' Naumann protests very strongly against forcible Germanization. There has been much done which Germany may be ashamed of.

'In Alsace-Lorraine and on the Danish borders . . . a great deal that was mean and of which we are ashamed has been done in the name of Germanism, but the German people as a whole have troubled themselves little about the matter. They have hardly noticed the varying experiments on the live bodies of these small groups, and have considered the authorities concerned well able to decide what would make for national safety. Now, during the war, many are beginning to form their own opinions, but they often start with the most elementary scheme —forcible Germanization—knowing very little of the many gloomy experiences which have already resulted from this

method all over the world, a method still possible in Russia but already become impracticable in the Vosges and Jutland.'

This confession is interesting, but is there any reason for thinking that Germany will ever learn to do otherwise?[1] It is important, however, to notice that the basis of the new Central Europe is to be a Super-State and racial toleration. But that does not mean any complete sovereignty of the small nations.

Of course it is characteristic of the outsider to dot the i's rather too definitely, but as a matter of fact does not this really mean the extension of the German Empire over the whole of Austria, and as many other nations as is possible? No doubt Austria would be treated with great consideration, at any rate at first, just as Bavaria was. But this Mid-Europe is to be German.

'Mid-Europe will have a German nucleus, will voluntarily use the German language, which is known all over the world and is already the language of intercourse within Central Europe, but must from the outset display toleration and flexibility in regard to all the neighbouring languages that are associated with it. For only so can that fundamental harmony grow up which is essential for a Great State, pressed and threatened from all sides. We Germans of the Empire need to devote much more genuine attention and care to this central problem of the allied monarchy than we have done hitherto.'

And then again, German organization is to spread everywhere. This is particularly to be the case in economic matters. The author celebrates, and no doubt to a large extent justly, the triumph of German organization both in war and in peace, and he proposes the creation of a 'systematized national economy.'

'The German is at last becoming heart and soul a political economic citizen. His ideal is and will be the organism and not free will, reason and not the blind struggle for existence.

[1] It is an interesting comment on these statements that a Ministry has been formed in Austria with the purpose of carrying on a policy of Germanification without recourse to the Austrian Parliament.

This constitutes our freedom, our self-development. By its means we shall enjoy our golden age as other conquering nations in other ages and with other abilities and excellences have done before us.'

The national State is to be separated from the economic and military State.

An admirable illustration of the *Mitteleuropa* idea is suggested by the new creation of the Kingdom of Poland. How ludicrous that is, from the point of view of satisfying national aspirations, is shewn by the fact that the new Poland is not to contain either Prussian or Austrian Poland. Nor can we have any doubt that the sole reason for the action which has been undertaken, which is quite contrary to the traditions of German policy, is at the present time to add the million available inhabitants of Poland to the German army, and in future to create a barrier between Germany and Russia. But, quite clearly, the relations of this new independent Kingdom of Poland are to be arranged upon the Central-European idea. It is to have, we are told, the closest military and economic connexion with the German Empire. That is to say, its army, and of course its foreign policy and its trade, are to be subordinate to the interests of Germany.

This, then, is the ideal which Germany is putting before itself now as to the result of the war; and it emphasizes the contrast between the German ideal and our own ideal. Naumann is full of enthusiasm for the fact that all the nations of Austria have joined together in this present war. How far that represents the reality may be much doubted. The military strength of Austria is too great to have allowed any constituent element in the country to rebel, but that suppression has been very vigorous in Bohemia and in some of the Slav countries there can be no doubt, and it cannot be doubted also that large bodies of the Slavonic and Roumanian troops of Austria have willingly gone over to the enemy when opportunity arose.

The English idea is quite clear. So far as possible, States should be built up on a national basis. We know that this cannot always be done; but so far as possible sovereign

rights should be secured to the various nationalities of Eastern Europe. And we believe that on that basis, and on that basis alone, can the full aspirations of the different peoples be fulfilled. Poland, Bohemia, the Serbo-Croatian peoples, the Roumanians, all form clear, distinct nationalities, by no means acquiescent in foreign rule, anxious for self-government and independence.[1] Is the future of Central Europe to be a great empire, built up on German military power, with the German military system extending everywhere, exploited throughout in the interest of German theories, voluntarily, as it is stated, adopting the German language, compelled more or less directly to accept the gift of German civilization and culture? Or is Germany on one side to be allowed freely to develop its own ideals, while the many varied races, so far as possible, should, in freedom and independence, become sovereign States? Naumann starts with the thesis that there is no place in the future for the small State. The answer is: Why not? Holland and Belgium are small States; they have built up their own individuality, they were prosperous and contented and well governed. Greece and Serbia and Bulgaria are far more prosperous and better governed as small but independent States than they were as parts of the Ottoman Empire which was certainly large. Is there any reason except the exaggerated claims of German ambition which would prevent the growth and development of small States corresponding to the various nationalities? At any rate these two books enable us to see quite clearly what are the German aims, and to contrast them with our own. How far shall we be able to reconstruct the small nationalities against the preponderating power of a great military nation?

For let us be quite clear: this Central Europe is very rapidly being created. The defeats which Austria and Turkey have suffered have done more than anything else to increase the power of Germany. German generals are supreme on every front but the Italian, and it is reported even there that as a result of the last defeat Germany has

[1] See especially an article in *The Soul of Russia* by Dr. Seton-Watson, 'Britain and the Slavonic World.'

been asked to provide assistance, and has said that she will do so if she is given the command of the armies. Austria has become definitely subject to Prussia. The economic progress has not been quite so great. But Turkey and Bulgaria have been compelled to pay their tribute to Prussia, and great efforts are being made to obtain the produce of the Hungarian harvest for Prussian use. There is no doubt at all that, with the gradual growth of German military power, economic power will follow. By whatever name you call it, however it be organized, the result of this war, if Germany wins—we may add if Germany is not defeated—will be to create a huge German empire extending from the Baltic to the Adriatic, 'from Heligoland to the Persian Gulf.'[1]

Of other books we have referred to that of Sir Thomas Holdich on *Political Frontiers and Boundary Making* will be of much service, when the end of the war approaches, for the negotiations and rearrangements which will then be necessary. For the present the observations on the admirable manner in which Germany has used her internal lines to strengthen her resources and on the value of her admirably constructed frontier systems of railways are most illuminating.

III

Since we last wrote, three main operations have occurred which demand our attention. The guerrilla warfare still seems to drag on in East Africa. Practically nothing has been done on any front against Turkey. It is in the successes on the western front, the French and English advance on the Somme and the French advance at Verdun, in the continued Italian advance on the Carso, and in the intervention of Roumania, that the main interest lies. Although operations were hindered during the whole of the month of October on the Somme, very considerable advances have

[1] This was a description of the future German Empire given in a lecture at the German Club in London in January 1914. See Dr. Simpson's lecture quoted at the head of this article, which also has a map from a postcard issued eight years ago shewing the same aspirations.

been made, and the French successes at Verdun, which in a few days snatched from the Germans all the results of the tremendous sacrifices of last spring, are brilliant. No doubt the Somme advance is slow. No doubt the enemy has time at present to make new fortifications and trenches further back. But if we remember how little the enemy were able to accomplish in two great attacks upon Ypres when they had an overwhelming superiority of numbers, we can realize the achievement of our troops. The German returns of casualties which are beginning to appear shew us how very large have been their losses, and the success gained has been a very real one. Both the Somme and Verdun shew that if we are able to attain, over a wide front, adequate artillery preparation, and if we are able to attack with adequate numbers, we may have good hopes for the future of even more striking successes.

The Italian advance on the Carso has been continuous and well timed. So far as we can judge from the information obtainable from enemy sources there have been great improvements both in the artillery and in the methods in which they have used it, and their successes have been substantial and progressive. The last advance was of particular value, because it compelled the Austrians to move more troops from the eastern front.

We turn to Roumania. Here there can be no doubt that there has been, to most people, a terrible blow. Those who are most silent in their judgement, who are most averse to criticizing the conduct of affairs, confess their disappointment, and there has been a very widespread, but unexpressed, feeling that all is not right. What did we expect? For some months we had been hoping that the Roumanians might come in on our side; that that would mean not only an increase of some 400,000 troops—at this stage in the warfare a very considerable number—but also an open road by which an advance could be made against the railway to Constantinople, and the first serious injury inflicted upon our opponents. We expected that by wise united action the Roumanians would not come in until all was prepared; that there would be strong forces ready

immediately to take advantage of the situation, and at the same time there would be a vigorous attack from Salonika. Exactly the reverse happened. The Roumanians came in, but no serious or adequate preparations seem to have been made. On the other hand it was the Germans who were prepared. They immediately had armies ready to attack Roumania with great severity, and it became apparent that the intervention of Roumania might have exactly the reverse effect to what was hoped—that it would put the granaries and oil-wells of that country at the command of the Central Powers, and would give them an unimpeded advance into Russia; while in Salonika, though some efforts have been made to advance, it is obvious that no attempt has been made to get together an adequate force for an attack upon a large scale.[1] That we have allowed ourselves to be fooled by King Constantine, and shewn ourselves timid and ineffective in our actions—that is how the facts appear. There may be some explanation that we do not know. We do not know where the blame is to be attached. But it must clearly be recognized that here there is another failure. It may be that the Germans, by concentrating troops on the Roumanian frontier and by sending an ultimatum to them, compelled them to intervene before their time. There may be other circumstances, not under our control. There is no evidence to enable us to decide whether the blame, if any, attaches to this country, or to France, or to Roumania itself, or to Russia. We deprecate the action of those papers which are quite convinced that their own country is always wrong. What is sufficient for our purpose at present is to know that there has been a failure and a disaster. Whether we shall be able to recover from it in any reasonable time is another matter.

And now let us turn to the enemy preparations. What are we to expect? Here is what Prince von Bülow says about the conduct of the war:

'The English character being what it is, since in the course

[1] The reasons for ineffective action at Salonika are not allowed to be stated.

of the world's history we are now for the first time at war with England, our future depends upon our employing all our means and all our forces with equal ruthlessness, so as to secure the victory and obtain a clear road. Since the German people, with unparalleled heroism, but also at the cost of fearful sacrifices, has waged war against half the world, it is our right and our duty to obtain safety and independence for ourselves at sea, and also really sufficient and, above all, practical guarantees for the freedom of the seas and for the further fulfilment of our economic and political tasks throughout the world. The result of the great struggle in this particular respect will be decisive for the total result of the war and also for the judgement that will be passed upon it.'

Let us be quite clear. Germany still hopes for victory, still expects to make peace more or less in her own interests, and is preparing to carry on the war during 1917 with increased ruthlessness. For that she demands, in the first place, men. What are the resources? We must for all practical purposes now look upon our adversary as Germany, assisted by a large number of troops from Austria, Bulgaria and Turkey. It is probable that the resources of these last have been exploited almost to the utmost of their capacity. Not long ago Enver Pasha stated that Turkey had now 3,000,000 men under arms. We do not like, on a point of this sort, to speak too definitely, but in all probability that statement was a lie. The Ottoman army at the beginning of the war was estimated at about a million. They have had to suffer very severe losses against the Russians on the Baghdad front, at the Egyptian front and at Gallipoli. Although our efforts against them have not, so far, been successful, we have been able to inflict very considerable losses upon them. No doubt they have raised more levies. Their able-bodied men are probably being enrolled with a total disregard of any other consideration. The economic well-being of the country is something to which they are entirely indifferent. Their equipment comes entirely, or almost entirely, from Germany or from German factories established at Constantinople, and there is nothing of that sort to be considered. But, making allowance for all this,

it is not probable that there are many resources available. Very considerable forces must be required to defend the country on all its frontiers, and in the Dobrudja and in Galicia large bodies of Turkish troops are now being employed. It would be interesting to know how many men at the present time are guarding Syria, what protection there is for such an important centre as Alexandretta, and how large a garrison is being left at Constantinople. The Bulgarian troops cannot be increased beyond the number already employed, and their losses must have been considerable. Austria will of course have a supply of younger men coming up, about 500,000 in each year. It has made use to the full of most of its people. To carry on the war with Italy and the war on the eastern front must strain its resources to the utmost. It has lost enormously in prisoners, in killed and wounded; and had it not been that Germany was able to come to its rescue, there can be little doubt that it would have been already knocked out.

We come back then to Germany. Germany has now over 200 divisions—that is to say, nominally over 4,000,000 men—in the field, the greater number upon the western front, but a very large number on the eastern front also. Since the last great Austrian defeat by Brusiloff some forty divisions have been moved south of the Pripet. It has also about a million men at least employed behind the armies. The casualties of the last month published are about 200,000. This is at the rate of nearly two and a half millions a year. What resources are there to make up these losses?

It has been calculated—we do not know how far correctly—that there are about from a million to a million and a half available for 1917. That is clearly not adequate. But we must not think that for that reason Germany is beaten. She will make every effort to provide more men. The greater part of her civil life is run by women, whose labours have been very carefully organized, by prisoners, and by inhabitants of the occupied countries who are being pressed into a sort of slavery. That sets free very large numbers. Then there is the further effort that is being made to make use of the Poles. It is calculated that here there are from

eight hundred thousand to a million men available, and it is thought that by the creation of this so-called Polish Kingdom it will be possible to use Russian subjects against their own country.

Let us just stop for a minute and point out one thing. From time to time we are still reminded that this action and a great deal more like this is contrary to the Hague Conventions, or to the usages of international law, and so on. It must be recognized that these things do not matter in the least. The German calculation is that either she will lose the war, in which case she will not suffer any further for any such action, or she will win the war, in which case everything she has done will be justified. The judgement of the war, she holds, will depend on the result. She has one purpose, and one only: that of winning the war. She is entirely indifferent to any public opinion. There is none at home and there is none abroad that she cares for. She will do anything that is necessary, whether contrary to law, or humanity, or the rights of neutrals, or the rights of individuals. She will win if she can and as she can. So that we may expect, as her resources get more strained, greater and greater recklessness. That she is feeling the pressure is undoubted. We have already instanced it in the act that the new front at Verdun was left open to the French. Still more in the composition of the army of Falkenhayn used against Roumania. We happen to know accurately how that is composed. A large number of new divisions were created, almost entirely by taking single battalions from other divisions. All the *Jäger* battalions of a long series of divisions have been taken for the purpose. That of course increases the number of available units of the army. It enables a new army to be created. But it is a process, obviously, of very great danger. It means that all along the front against Russia the army is being steadily depleted, which is a process which success will justify, but will be very serious in case of failure. If the Germans succeed in treating Roumania as they have treated Serbia, they will gain much in prestige, in material resources; they will put out of action another army; and therefore

this process of creating new armies will be for a time successful.

But there can be no doubt, we think, that from the men available it will be possible, some time early in 1917, to bring into the field very considerable forces. It is probable that, at some point to be selected by Hindenburg, probably but not certainly at the eastern front, there will appear in the spring of 1917 a considerable and formidable new army formed partly by making use of reserve battalions not at present employed at the front, partly by the new troops obtained by combing out the civil services at home, and the younger classes of men called up. Great efforts will be made, in fact, to achieve a real success. It will probably mean an attempt upon the Russians at some more or less unexpected point. The place may depend upon the final result of the Roumanian campaign. The hope will be that the Russian line will be pierced, that the Russians will be knocked out, and that thus it will be possible to concentrate forces against the western front, which will be held in the meantime by a somewhat thin line. It is expected that the thin line will be able to hold the very strong fortifications. This army will be helped by a great accumulation of guns and munitions. At the beginning of the war Germany was far ahead in the number of its cannon and its supply of shells. It was far ahead in every form of equipment. In the recent battles on the western front we have shewn that we have attained the superiority. Our shell fire has been more terrific, has shewn greater concentration and probably greater ability of direction. But Germany is quick to learn its lesson. We know now that it is saving its munitions as much as possible. All this is preparatory to a great concerted action in the spring, in which it will make full use of any lesson that it has learnt from us.

Meantime, and to support this, great attention will be paid to this country. The submarine warfare has become once more very serious, and it has taken a form which it is much more difficult to meet. The original idea of Germany was to concentrate submarines all round the English coast. The

places they haunted soon became known, and our Admiralty shewed great skill, enterprise and ingenuity in meeting them. They succeeded practically in overpowering them, and the losses they inflicted were, we have reason to believe, very serious. But the new submarine warfare is of a different kind. It is not confined to home waters, or to particular places. It is scattered further and further afield. Newer submarines are capable of longer voyages. They carry a larger amount of petrol. No doubt there are still various means by which vessels which are claimed to be neutral are used to assist them. It is obvious that we cannot concentrate attention in the same way against a submarine which may suddenly appear on the Norwegian coast and attack three or four vessels, which will then be heard of next several hundred miles off, which may attack ships coming out of New York harbour, or in the least expected parts of the Mediterranean. New ingenuity and new methods are required to meet these. We cannot but think that the time has now come when all merchant ships should be armed; when their men, their own sailors, should be trained to man the guns; and when they should be expected to travel three or four at a time.

Meanwhile the usual bullying of neutrals continues. Not long ago Sweden prohibited submarines appearing in their territorial waters. As this was injurious to Russian submarines, and also to English submarines acting with them, it received the strong approval of Germany. Recently Norway, wishing to protect its own commerce, has done exactly the same thing, and Germany considers it an infringement of neutrality. There is no good holding up our hands in horror at that. It is only an illustration of the fact that we have to recognize that Germany will carry on this war with ruthlessness. That is to say, it will do everything conducive to winning the war, without any regard to any principle of justice or right or consistency. At the present time it considers it a perfectly legitimate thing to torpedo, without inspection and without warning, a ship belonging to a neutral power which may or may not have contraband of war on it, without considering in the least whether

or no the sailors upon it are likely to escape. But if that ship was armed and if that ship was to make any attempt to attack the submarine, it would consider it an act of piracy and a *casus belli*. This is what Germany considers the freedom of the seas. The submarine menace is a serious danger, and demands vigorous and carefully thought-out action on our part. We must leave neutrals to deal with it in their own way. If they like having their ships sunk without retaliating, we cannot help it.

The activity of submarines will probably be accompanied, when the spring comes round, by renewed Zeppelin attacks. These will be kept up, not so much for the sake of the harm that they do, but for the fact that they keep many men and guns in this country. If they compel us to keep 20,000 men and a thousand guns here, that is so much gain to the Germans, and they will probably hold that it is worth the risk of possibly losing another Zeppelin. But that can probably be avoided, because it is the threat of Zeppelins, as much as the actual attacks, which is dangerous. If it is known that they may or can come, we must keep up the protection, and therefore the men must be kept in this country. If we were to remove them, the attacks would become serious again. And no doubt this would be accompanied by great activity or apparent activity on the part of the fleet, and by renewed threats of invasion, the whole being directed towards keeping as many men as possible in this country. It is hardly necessary to emphasize to our readers now that so long as the German fleet remains in being, if it never ventures outside the Kiel Canal, it is a continuous menace and danger to this country. It locks up the greater part of our fleet, it prevents us from carrying on the war as we might like in other places, and we know that if by some accident or some good fortune for the Germans they were able to bring into contact their whole fleet with a portion of ours, it might be very serious to us. It is well to remember that, when war is going on, the country cannot be free from danger.

Let us make no mistake: as one of our statesman recently said, 'the country is in deadly peril.' The determination

of Germany is still strong; she will exploit her resources to the uttermost; she will by 1917 have reorganized her artillery and increased her output of munitions so as to rival the French and ourselves on the western front and completely overpower the Russians; she has every preparation ready for the invasion of this country when the suitable time comes; she hopes to be able to starve us out by her submarine policy.

What can we do? We hope to be able to make a successful attack on the western front. We may succeed, but there are two great difficulties: During the winter Germany will be able to construct nearly as strong positions as those we have captured at such a terrible loss of life, and we shall not have the same superiority that we have recently had in artillery and other munitions of war. Our experience shews how hard a task we have had. It is not likely to be less hard in the future. It is a grave misfortune that we have not been able to press our advantage further in 1916.

At Salonika there is danger of a great disaster, a disaster equal to that of Gallipoli or Kut. We had the choice of two policies, for both of which there was much to be said. The one was the policy of the western front: that except for purely defensive purposes we should concentrate all our forces in France and Flanders and win a great victory there and thus break the power of Germany. That is an intelligible policy. The other is to recognize that to cut the line to Constantinople would have been the greatest blow to German prestige, and would weaken her seriously, and that an attack from Salonika with powerful Russian forces co-operating from the other side might have effected this. There were serious difficulties of transit and communications to surmount, but had we attacked with adequate forces on a sufficiently wide front, and with proper preparation, it would have been quite possible. What has been achieved with inadequate forces proves that, and if the Germans have been able to pierce a tunnel through Mt. Amanus on the Baghdad railway during the war, we ought to have been able to surmount the engineering difficulties. Our troops are able to fight without a parcel

post from home every day, and our Army Service Corps can get on (as they have done) without a paved road to the front. What was necessary for such an enterprise was a determined policy, a force of not less than 700,000 men, an advance on a wide front so as to be able to turn the enemy's positions, with the co-operation of a strong Italian advance from Albania. This would have been a great undertaking (like the German invasion of Roumania), but, with an adequate offensive from Russia, probably successful.

Now when these two courses were either of them possible, we appear to have chosen neither, but to have made a compromise. We have made an inadequate advance from Salonika. Don't let us make any mistake. What has been accomplished may only mean temporary gain, unless adequate reinforcements are sent. If the German victory in Roumania had become sufficiently complete its armies and its guns would be turned against Salonika. The capture of Monastir might be almost as transient a success as the Roumanian invasion of Transylvania, and the lines of Salonika be battered by German guns.

Such was the situation in December. The submarine menace has been described; the supply of shipping for our needs, whether our own or those of neutrals, seemed inadequate and daily being reduced, the shortage of food increasing, the price of provisions was rising, Ireland had been completely alienated and was on the verge of revolt, the people of this country had not yet been properly disciplined for enduring what is necessary to finish the war.

IV

It is just at this time that a change of profound importance has taken place in the government of the country. Mr. Asquith has resigned the office of Prime Minister, and at the same time almost all the Liberal members of the late Government have retired. Mr. Lloyd George has formed a Ministry definitely designed for carrying on the war and directed to that point only with a Cabinet consisting only of five members.

We have no hesitation in saying that in the opinion of the great majority of the country of all classes a change was essential. It is useless and foolish to talk of a conspiracy. There has been no conspiracy. The attack on the late Liberal Administration was as open and frank as any attack has ever been, and it arose from the profound conviction of those who directed it that the late Government, as it was constituted, was a singularly inefficient machine for carrying on the war, and that with all his undoubted ability as a Parliamentary leader Mr. Asquith was by temperament and training entirely unfitted to be the leader of the country in the crisis that we are going through. The opinion was expressed by certain newspapers, but it was endorsed by a very wide circle in all classes. The country might not know all that went on, but it had sufficient evidence to judge. It could see the way in which the question of compulsory military service was dealt with. It could contrast the speech of Mr. Asquith with the action of Mr. Lloyd George on the munitions question. It could see the same tendency to delay and compromise on many other questions on which it was quite able to form an opinion. Above all it could judge by results. The country has been extraordinarily patient, and rightly so. It has recognized the difficulties of the situation. It has never held the Liberal Government to task for its inadequacy of preparation, however culpable it may have been, for it has been conscious of its own share in the blame. It has had enough to bear. Gallipoli, Kut, Ireland, Roumania, Salonika, Greece, all in varying ways represent failures. Now, it says, we have given you every chance, we have recognized your great difficulties; we do not doubt the excellency of your intentions, but you have not succeeded: it is time that other men and other methods should have their opportunity. You have worked hard, you have borne the burden and heat of the contest for nearly two and a half years, so you can honourably hand on your labours to successors, and rest until the country calls on you again with such honour and dignity as we can give you. That we believe represents the general opinion of the people.

And the change took place in the only way possible.

A vote of censure and defeat in the House was not possible with a Coalition Government. An appeal to the country had been made impossible. The Crown could not take any direct initiative. This is surely a defect in our Constitution. The only way for a change to take place was that someone who knew and recognized the defects of the position should have taken a step such as Mr. Lloyd George did, and that his action should be endorsed by the House and the country. That it has been. The Conservative party, the Liberal war party, the Labour party have all done so directly or indirectly. Had the Labour party decided differently the Government would still have been formed. There would probably have been an appeal to the country and the majority of those who were not prepared to support Mr. Lloyd George would have lost their seats.

And as to the future. The first question is whether the change is not too late. The situation is a most serious one. There has been great delay on many points where delay may mean difficulty or disaster. Has Mr. Asquith been ' too late ' even in resigning ?

The next question that will be asked is whether Mr. Lloyd George is equal to the task. He will have every chance given him. The readers of this Review probably represent a section of the people who have as just right as anyone in it to resent what he has said and done. None of those things will be remembered against him. If he is single-minded and patriotic he will have the whole-hearted support in his task of every conservative Churchman in the country. If he shews the ability for the task that he has undertaken, his success will be received with enthusiasm. For there can be no doubt about the stupendous nature of the work before him, and he is facing it unflinchingly. He is giving himself full powers, a commanding position, every advantage that is possible, and also full responsibility. If he fails, the failure will be, so far as any human being is responsible, Mr. Lloyd George's ; if he makes an error of judgement, the responsibility of error will lie with him. He has had the courage boldly to undertake the task.

Has he the ability? We know that he has enthusiasm, energy, driving-power. All that he has exhibited in the large body of legislation which he has succeeded in driving through all the obstructions that meet the reformer and in the creation of the munitions department. The administrative success of the war has been his. It has always been said that he has no power of mastering detail. That is a defect which others can make up for. The question that people will ask is, What is his power of judgement? Can this country trust the judgement of Mr. Lloyd George in co-operation with Lord Curzon and Lord Milner. For those are the three men who will count. Professionally they will have as admirable advice as is possible. We believe that the judgement of General Robertson and Admiral Jellicoe is as good as the country can provide. They will have serious decisions to make. Will they make the right ones? The great danger—most people probably think—is that Mr. Lloyd George may be too anxious to do something startling and effective.

As for the rest, the Government is on paper at any rate extraordinarily strong. The majority of Ministers are appointed because they understand and are interested in the work of their department. Trade is to be controlled by a series of able business men; agriculture is to be administered by Mr. Rowland Prothero, who knows as much about it, both theoretically and practically, as anyone in the country. Dr. Fisher—Vice-Chancellor of Sheffield University—is to preside over the Board of Education. He is an able man, and what the feelings of the Board will be under the rule of a man who has had practical experience of education is difficult to imagine. The experiment of being governed by people who understand what they are about will be novel and interesting.

What is the task before us? The first is that the country must be organized on the supposition that the war will be a lasting one and that the food-supply be properly maintained. This means the fullest development of the agricultural capacity of the land—a benefit which will be permanent. It means the provision of adequate transport—that again

will be a permanent benefit—and the organization of the distribution of food. It was necessary to begin with London hotels and restaurants. Until all the rich are living simply it is not possible to deal with the nation as a whole. That will however mean very little saving, because most of the well-conditioned families of the country adopted war habits as soon as the war began. It is the extravagance of the poor, or rather a large section of the poor, that has to be restrained. The country could get on quite as well as it does at present if it consumed half the amount of wine and beer and spirits, half the amount of tobacco, and half the amount of sweets that it does. That can be attained by regulating the supply of material; it must of course be accompanied by the fixing of a maximum price for each article.

The whole question of the supply of men has to be faced. We must provide an adequate number of men for the armies in the field, and also for agriculture, for munitions and for trade. Compulsory service for every man, and for every woman who is without home duties, if medically fit, may be necessary, and if wisely administered will do no harm. In spite of the opposition of labour, the employment of imported labour in this country may have to be resorted to. Ireland must do her duty. Again, none of this will do injury to the nation. A period of discipline is good for every one.

The submarine menace has to be dealt with. How serious this is each day's news tells us. We are informed, and it is probably true, that Germany is building submarines as hard as she can, and that after the New Year she intends to use them with greater ruthlessness. That means greater ruthlessness as regards neutrals in particular. With that side of the problem we cannot deal directly. As regards our own ships the necessary course is to arm them. How serious that is the number of guns required—15,000—reveals. It may be suggested that far greater protection will be gained if our merchant ships sail always in twos and threes. That will mean that the danger to which a submarine is exposed

in attacking a ship will be far greater. Armed trawlers for each fishing fleet would be considerable protection.

The use of the navy is one of those questions which has caused a good deal of comment. It must be remembered that so long as the German fleet is in being there must be an adequate fleet ready to meet it at any time of the day or night, and so strong as to contain it. If any offensive is to be undertaken, it must be by a second or supernumerary fleet. If there is any desire for naval attack, it must not be carried out by our first fleet, for that would mean courting disaster. It will be the business of our Admiralty, either by building new ships or by making use of the ships of our Allies, to get together a force adequate for whatever it undertakes.

And then there is finally the policy of the war. The most urgent question is the Salonika offensive. Is it to be made effective, or are our forces to be completely withdrawn, or are we to hold the Salonika lines? It must be remembered that a German offensive with heavy guns may be the policy they adopt, and that there may be difficulty in avoiding a great disaster. The problem is of the utmost gravity. Much must depend upon how far Roumania is able to hold out with a shortened front, and how far Russian assistance may be effective.

Above all, there is the problem of really effective action on the western front.

We know that Germany means to make a supreme effort to be victorious in 1917. She is calling on all her reserves of men, and trying to rival the output of munitions which we have made this year. We may expect somewhere a prodigious attack with a great accumulation of guns and of shells. The Germans will do all they can to repay us for the losses we have inflicted on them this year. They have never lost the hope of a raid or invasion of our shores. The whole plan for such an action is worked out to its smallest detail. Let us repeat. The country is still in serious peril, and no effort of statesman or people must be relaxed until it is over. 'He that endures to the end shall be saved.'

December 21, 1916.

V

Since the first part of this article was written a new turn has been given to the discussions about the war by the publication first of all of what are called German Peace Proposals, and then by the Peace note of the American President. The situation thus created demands careful and respectful attention, and it is well for us to try to consider what circumstances or conditions would make peace in the interests of the Entente Powers possible

On Tuesday, December 12, a special meeting was held of the German Reichstag. It had been much advertised beforehand, and interest excited by the air of mystery thrown over its proceedings. At that meeting the Imperial Chancellor, Dr. Bethmann Hollweg, made one of those somewhat inflated and rhetorical speeches to which we are accustomed. In the course of it he read a note addressed jointly by the four Central Powers to the other belligerents and transmitted to them by means of the neutrals. The contents of both the speech and the note were alike in character. The victories of Germany and her allies are asserted in no uncertain terms.[1] 'Germany and her allies gave proof of their unconquerable strength in this struggle. They have gained gigantic advantages over adversaries superior in number and war material. Our lines stand unshaken against the ever-repeated attempts made by the armies of our enemies.' Equally emphatically the righteousness and innocence of Germany and her allies is maintained. 'The four allied Powers were obliged to take up arms in order to defend justice and the liberty of national evolution.' 'Germany,' it was said in a note to the Pope, 'is carrying on a war of defence against the enemies who aim at her destruction.' In spite, however, of her gigantic strength and her unassailable position Germany does not wish to crush or annihilate her opponents. Moved by a deep moral and religious duty towards humanity the Emperor is prepared to make steps towards peace. 'If in spite of this

[1] It must be remembered that there are considerable and important verbal differences between different copies of the note.

offer of peace and reconciliation the struggle should go on, the four allied Powers are resolved to continue it until a victorious end, but they solemnly decline every responsibility for this before humanity and history.'

The reply of the Allies was handed in to the United States Ambassador in Paris on December 30, 1916. It repudiates strongly the two material assertions 'the one professing to throw upon the Allies the responsibility of the war, and the other proclaiming the victory of the Central Powers. The Allies cannot admit a claim which is thus untrue in each particular.' The reply states that 'the putting forward by the Imperial Government of a sham proposal, lacking all substance and precision, would appear to be less an offer of peace than a war manœuvre.' The Allies demand reparation. 'As for the future, the disasters caused by the German declaration of war, and the innumerable outrages committed by Germany and her allies, demand penalties, reparation, and guarantees; Germany avoids the mention of any of these.' The object of these overtures is:

'to justify in advance in the eyes of the world a new series of crimes—submarine warfare, deportations, forced labour and forced enlistment of inhabitants against their own countries, and violations of neutrality. The Allies refuse to consider a proposal which is empty and insincere. Their aims are described as "reparation of violated rights and liberties, recognition of the principle of nationalities and the free existence of small States."'

The American note which is courteously worded was communicated on December 20, 1916. Its purport is to ask each side to state exactly what they are fighting for. The reason is that so long as they confine themselves to generalities there is no possibility of distinguishing between the aims of the two sides. The President

'takes the liberty of calling attention to the fact that the objects which the statesmen of the belligerents on both sides have in mind in this war are virtually the same as stated in general terms to their own people and to the world. Each

side desires to make the rights and privileges of weak peoples and small States as secure against aggression or denial in the future as the rights and privileges of the great and powerful States now at war. Each wishes to be made secure in the future, along with all other nations and peoples, against the recurrence of wars like this, and against aggression or selfish interference of any kind,' and so on.

This mild academic sarcasm has been misunderstood. The President does not mean that he really thinks both sides are equally virtuous, but that they say they are. He wants them to state their terms with precision, so that he may know if both mean what they say, because it is obvious that if they do the war might end to-morrow. The German reply evades the question and demands a conference. Since then the Allies have replied, and other diplomatic notes have followed, defining more particularly their aims.

This is the open situation. What intrigues have been and are going on under the surface must be a matter of speculation, as also must be the motives of the leading actors. A few remarks may be hazarded.

There can be no doubt that Germany is feeling the pressure of the blockade and of the whole burden of the war on the double front. To what extent it may be difficult to say. But unless she can break the blockade she is within a measurable distance of starvation and must be nearing the end of her man power. She is therefore taking advantage of her success in Roumania to try to make peace on her own terms. What these may be have not been stated, but all sorts of rumours have been allowed to appear designed to impress neutrals with her moderation and to create dissension between the Allies. She is prepared to give up France and Belgium, if she can secure her path to the East ; she would very probably sacrifice both advantages to be able to injure this country. She believes that her armies have been completely victorious, but the fruits of victory have been taken from her by England. To get an opportunity of isolating us, and time to strengthen herself, would be her aim. She would give up many of her

conquests in return for her colonies If we refuse, she will point out to our allies that our selfish policy is injuring them. If we were to agree, she would make each one of them a fortified menace to us. She will try to persuade America to join her in demanding what she is pleased to call the freedom of the seas that she may nullify the influence of our fleet in war. She will agree to a reduction of armaments on condition that our fleet is reduced, hoping to evade the restrictions herself, as she did when Napoleon limited her army.

Peace on German terms would mean the most deadly peril to us and ultimately to our allies.

The publication at this moment of Mr. J. W. Headlam's book *The Issue* is most timely. In the Introduction he discusses with great lucidity the situation created by the war. What Germany has aimed at is the destruction of the European system which guarantees the freedom and independence of the different nations. Unless she is defeated she will attain her aim.

'An inconclusive peace would in fact imply two things, the increased power of Germany and the certainty of further war between Germany and Great Britain. But in addition to this it would mean that after the war Germany would be even more convinced than she was before of the essential value of that which we call militarism. . . . But let us suppose on the other hand that the war is carried on to its inevitable termination, that the resistance of the German armies is broken down and the spirit of the German people is broken by the effect of the blockade. A conclusion of this kind would make clear to the German nation in the only way in which it could be made that immeasurable ambition inevitably brings with it Nemesis. . . . Men talk much of the terms of peace; it is not the terms of peace which are important; what is important is victory.'

What is important is victory. It is often said that force is no remedy. That is just one of those profoundly untrue remarks which people are in the habit of making. On the contrary, as against militarism force is the only remedy. Two instances may suffice The victory of

1814–1815 against France destroyed French militarism and enabled the Allies to treat France justly and fairly. The English victory in the Boer War produced a united South Africa.

The German offer of peace was arrogant and insolent. As a leading neutral journal described it, it was like the classic brigand demanding a traveller's money or his life. To accept her offer would mean more war in the future and probably the destruction of our empire. We have no desire to continue the war, but reason and justice alike demand that there shall be no slacking of our efforts. Germany is at bay, and like all wild animals at bay she is very dangerous. Her resources are strained to the uttermost, but she is very strong. Any relaxation of strain, any want of vigilance on our part might be fatal in their consequences. With a full sense of the responsibility, with a full sense of the danger, we must repeat that self-interest and justice alike demand, that as we had no alternative but to enter the war, so there is no alternative course now but to continue it until with God's help we have broken the power of Germany by undoubted victory.

PROFESSOR HARNACK ON NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

Zur Revision der Prinzipien der neutestamentlichen Textkritik; die Bedeutung der Vulgata für den Text der katholischen Briefe, und der Anteil des Hieronymus an dem Übersetzungswerk. Von Adolf Harnack. 'Beiträge zur Einleitung in das neue Testament,' VII Heft. (Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1916.)

In this monograph Professor Harnack has broken new ground. It is needless to say that he brings to the work his own unrivalled learning, enthusiasm, and power of making his subject interesting, nay exciting. The very fact, too, that he has not been by profession a textual critic gives freshness to his treatment and

enables him to see inferences and conclusions which a specialist may from very familiarity have missed; and for these the specialist will be grateful even if, on reflexion, he does not adopt them all, or if he stops to point out that here and there Harnack has made a slip that betrays the amateur.[1]

The importance of the Vulgate for the textual criticism of the New Testament has been more and more recognized of late years. As regards the Gospels and Acts, the prolegomena to the big Oxford edition have, we think, made it clear that the Greek MSS by which Jerome corrected the Old Latin must have been mainly of the ℵ B type; and in turn, the Old Latin itself is by far the most important witness to that 'Western' text which some critics now are inclined to rate as of higher authority than the 'Neutral.' No doubt the Clementine Vulgate of 1592 admitted a large number of mediaeval corruptions and additions; but even allowing for these it would be no exaggeration to say that the Latin theologian with his official version of the New Testament has possessed a text much nearer the original autographs than has the Greek with his *Textus Receptus* or the Englishman with his Authorized Version. Harnack goes so far as to assert that could a scholar in the Sixteenth century have obtained a good MS of the Vulgate and—with the help afforded by any ordinary Greek MS—have retranslated the New Testament back into Greek, he would have possessed a better text than that of any Greek MS then obtainable.

The publication of the Oxford *editio minor* of the Vulgate New Testament has enabled Harnack to perform this feat for the Catholic Epistles, and to compare the text thus obtained with those of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, Weiss, and von Soden; and also with the most important of the Greek uncials and early versions. It is a congenial task; there is nothing he

[1] For instance, in St. Jude 13 Harnack renders the *confusiones* of the Vulgate back into *ἀναχύσεις* (against *αἰσχύνας* of all the Greek MSS), a translation which he justifies on the ground that in 1 St. Peter iv 4 *confusionem* corresponds to *ἀνάχυσιν* (see pp. 38 95). But there is no need to postulate a primitive *ἀναχύσεις* in Jude; *αἰσχύνη* is frequently translated by *confusio* both in the Vulgate and in the Old Latin, see Phil. iii 19, Hebr. xii 2, Apoc. iii 18, and compare R. Harris, *A Study of Codex Bezae*, p. 106.

Again, on p. 112 he draws attention to the strange fact that the use of *hic* to express the definite article is only found in connexion with *ὁ κόσμος*. This is very nearly true, but not quite; has he forgotten the magnificent 'ex hoc nunc et usque in saeculum' of Pss. cxiii 18, cxx 8, cxxx 3 (= *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος*)?

loves more than such reconstruction, whether it be of 'Q' as a whole, or of any New Testament passage the 'original' form of which may furnish data for an original theory. The general results he has attained in this case may be summarized as follows.

The Old Latin version, as preserved *e.g.* in the Bobbio palimpsest (*s*) of St. James and 1 St. Peter, was an extremely literal translation; it originated probably in an interlinear version, such as is preserved in Codex Δ of the Gospels and G of the Pauline Epistles. This text was revised by Jerome; the numberless cases in which its clumsy word-for-word renderings have been turned into the good Latin of the Vulgate are a proof that it was worked over by a scholar, and just such a scholar as Jerome; Harnack has not a word to say to the theories of some hardy critics, that Jerome never revised beyond the Gospels; or that his revision in the Epistles has completely perished and its place been taken by the work of a Pelagius or a Cassiodorus. But Jerome did little more than correct the Latin; the underlying Greek text he left practically untouched; so that where such a MS as *s* is extant we may simply delete 'vg' from our apparatus criticus; it has no independent authority, and is simply a second edition of *s*. Now this underlying Greek text is both early and good; it is probably earlier than Origen, and is closely allied with A and the Egyptian versions. The text of A in the Catholic Epistles is rated very high by Harnack; here he has behind him the authority of Westcott, who remarked as long ago as 1883, 'the text of A, which represents a far more ancient type in this Epistle (1 St. John) than in the Gospels, contains many peculiar readings, in which it has often the support of the Vulgate.'[1] Westcott, however, seldom followed this group; but Harnack has the courage of his convictions and places it above ℵ B. How Dean Burgon would have rejoiced to see such an independent critic dethroning these Kaisars!

If we ask *why* we are to believe in the special virtues of A and the Vulgate, we are of course brought down ultimately to the consideration of individual passages in which their readings are demonstrably right. Here Harnack is at his best; his examination is exhaustive, his reasoning clear, and his conclusions bold; his work will have to be taken into account by all commentators as well as textual critics in the future. And yet it is just here that we venture occasionally to disagree with him.

[1] *The Epistles of St. John*, p. xxiv, quoted by Harnack, p. 66.

For instance, in 1 St. John v. 6 the Greek text is practically unanimous in reading *καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ μαρτυροῦν, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ ἀληθεία,* 'and it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth'; but the Vulgate reads 'Et Spiritus est qui testificatur quoniam Christus est veritas,' 'and it is the Spirit which testifieth that Christ is the truth.' Harnack defends this reading on the ground that it fits the context better; that the reading of the Greek MSS is rather awkward; and that *ὅτι* after *μαρτυροῦν* would more naturally mean 'that' than 'because.' It may, however, be urged in answer that we have in any case to explain how the false reading arose; how did *πνεῦμα* get altered into *χριστός*, or *χριστός* into *πνεῦμα*? Neither of these could have arisen by a scribe's error *in Greek*, for the words have nothing in common, whether they be written at length or expressed by contractions (ΠΝ̄Α and X̄C or XP̄C). But *in Latin* nothing would be more likely than a confusion; XP̄S and SP̄S differ by only one letter. As the Greek therefore is unanimous for *πνεῦμα* there is a strong presumption that it is right; and the easy corruption in the Latin raises this probability to something like certainty.

Similarly in 1 St. John iv. 3 Harnack maintains that the Vulgate 'omnis spiritus qui solvit Iesum' (*πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν*) is right, against the *πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν* of all the Greek MSS. Certainly the Latin evidence *for* *λύει* is as strong as the Greek evidence is *against*; and there is in addition the statement of Socrates (*H.E.* vii 32) that Nestorius was ignorant that the *πάλαια ἀντίγραφα* of this passage read *λύει*. Harnack thinks that the *μὴ ὁμολογεῖ* has come in from the context, from 2 St. John 7, and also from the desire of the orthodox to see Christians denounced as anti-Christs if they professed an insufficient creed. But on the other hand, though it may be probable that *ὁ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ* came in from the context, it is equally probable that the author wrote it himself; it is exactly in his style; nothing is more characteristic than this solemn iteration of propositions, first in affirmative then in negative form. With regard to Socrates' assertion it may be possible, as Westcott pointed out, that he is referring to Latin, not Greek, MSS; and finally, the chance of a scribe's error must not be forgotten—ΟΛΥΕΙ may be a corruption of the latter part of [ΟΜΗΟΜ]ΟΛΟΓΕΙ; and it would be a venial sin for a scribe to have skipped a few of the preceding Ms and Os.

But these are criticisms on details. For the main thesis

of Professor Harnack we have nothing but praise; he has rightly drawn attention to a fact which many critics have ignored —the importance of the Vulgate. A version which is found to agree, in different parts of the New Testament, with the Greek MSS which are judged to have the most ancient type of text in those parts, is worthy of more respectful attention than it has hitherto received.

H. J. White.

SHORT NOTICES.

I. Biblical Studies.

A Sketch of Amos and Hosea: Their Message and their Times. By the Rev. Andrew Tweedie, B.D., Minister of Strachan Parish Church. (Blackwood and Sons. 1916.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

It is hardly tactful—or true—to say, as Mr. Tweedie does,[1] that 'the current tone [of the religion criticized by Amos] was the High Church spirit,' and metaphors merge, if they do not mix, in the statement[2] that people who oppose 'the tide . . . are the salt of the earth, who . . . utter divine words in the ears of men.'

But such trifling blemishes are very far from typical; and these studies, shewing real grasp of their important subject, will be read with pleasure and profit. There are two or three apt illustrations from modern history (*e.g.* on p. 84—Rome in 1838; and p. 105—Sixteenth-century France).

The Book of Jonah: A Study of Biblical Purpose and Method. By the Rev. T. H. Dodson, M.A., Rector of Wootton and Canon of Lincoln. (S.P.C.K. 1916.) 1*s.* net.

If the old lady who was ready to go to the stake rather than relinquish her literal interpretation of Jonah had read Canon Dodson's little book she would have come to realize that what is really worth a martyr's testimony is the spiritual teaching Jonah imparts. Canon Dodson interprets it as a sacred allegory, and truly describes this much-debated Scripture as an 'exquisite little tract.' His work calls for unstinted praise: it should prove specially helpful to preachers, for it abounds in homiletic suggestion,—and Jonah ought to be preached from much more often than it is.

[1] P. 12. [2] P. 37.

The Gospel according to St. Mark. Edited by the Ven. W. C. Allen, M.A., Archdeacon of Manchester. 'Oxford Church Biblical Commentary.' (Rivingtons.) *7s. 6d.* net.

The Gospel according to St. Mark. Edited by the Rev. A. Plummer, D.D. 'Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.' (Cambridge University Press.) *2s.*

In his commentary on the second Gospel the Archdeacon of Manchester has given us a most stimulating piece of work. The Introduction is full of interest, and with marked conciseness brings forward many subjects of importance. There is an important section dealing with the dates of the Synoptic Gospels, in which we find that Mr. Allen has moved towards an earlier date for these writings. The movement has been gradually gathering force, and has been influenced by Harnack's argument in favour of dating Acts in the lifetime of St. Paul, and from another direction by such studies as that of Canon Streeter in the Oxford volume of studies on the Synoptic problem. The Archdeacon makes the earlier date for Acts his starting-point, and then makes use of the attitude of the first and second Gospels in face of the great conflict between St. Paul and the Judaistic Church. He is led to conclude that St. Mark's Gospel should be dated between 44 and 49 A.D., during St. Peter's absence from Jerusalem. The tradition that it was written in Rome cannot be traced behind Clement of Alexandria, towards the end of the Second century, and cannot be made decisive, as is done by Dr. Plummer, who retains the customary date 65–70 A.D. The ground opened up by the Archdeacon will have to be worked, and other aspects of the Gospels given due weight before a conclusion can be reached. The question is affected by the further point that the original Gospel was written in Aramaic. This is very questionable and we cannot feel that the argument for it is strengthened by using it as ground for thinking that the original Gospel ended at xvi 8. Perhaps the slenderest link in the chain is the otherwise attractive suggestion that St. Matthew's Gospel was written at Antioch about the year 50 A.D.

For the study of the Gospel a more important part of the Introduction is the consideration of the Person of our Lord and of His miraculous powers; and the longer notes in the commentary are largely devoted to the special instances bearing on these points. All this seems to us to be done with the care and exactness that we have come to associate with Mr. Allen's work. The notes are interesting and suggestive, and also decided in favour of the historicity of the record. We are glad to see

the insistence on the point that our Lord's powers are beyond our experience, and that therefore we are unable to decide their limits. For the feeding of the multitude there is strong insistence that the narrative records fact, however difficult may be the understanding of it. In dealing with the healing of the demoniac, is it not the modern mind that would say 'What demon would prefer to live in a pig's frame to roaming unfettered?' Was not the ancient belief that the expelled demon wandered about seeking rest?

We are not very confident of the value of the translation. Its one aim seems to be to bring out the characteristics of St. Mark's style in every detail. It suffers, we think, from exaggeration. Is there much to be said for such renderings as 'And they enter-in into Capharnaum. And forthwith on the Sabbath He was teaching into the synagogue,' or 'Except they wash pugme their hands'?

Mr. Allen's decision to avoid discussion of the opinions of other commentators has been carried out rigidly. We felt a certain sense of disappointment to find the sayings that bear on the death of our Lord, as they affect the doctrine of the Atonement, treated with only one interpretation outlined. One or two of the references, *e.g.* to the *Journal of Theological Studies*, are to books outside the easy reach of most readers. But we are unwilling to press this criticism, for the brevity and directness of the study of the Gospel are very valuable and excellent features. Dr. Plummer's commentary strikes us as a useful piece of work, on the same model as the rest of the Cambridge Bible. One sometimes feels that these commentaries are overloaded with small notes, and that it would be a gain to pass over some of the less important points and concentrate on the larger subjects. In this volume the notes are a useful summary of discussions of difficulties, or of information on the use of words and subject-matter.

The Epistle to the Romans. Edited by R. St. John Parry, B.D. 'Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges.' (Cambridge University Press.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

This Commentary is a careful and independent piece of work, which in most ways has been compiled clearly for the needs of younger students, but at times suffers from the use of language that is unnecessarily technical and difficult. The Introduction is adequate, and that part which deals with the occasion and circumstances of the Epistle is good. Here there is freshness of

treatment, which shews that Mr. Parry has a real appreciation of the historical background of the early Church.

It will be remembered that the commentary on the English text of this Epistle in the Cambridge series has a very distinct character of its own, and is marked by Calvinistic tendencies of thought. It may be well to state that Mr. Parry does not follow Dr. Moule. At the beginning of the note on cc. ix-xi in the Appendix he warns his readers that the difficulty lies in the fact that we think primarily of the destiny of the individual as such whereas St. Paul thinks first of the purpose of God and of the work to be done in the execution of that purpose. For him God's call to take part in this work is the crowning instance of God's mercy, and man's responsibility is maintained in that he is a living instrument with choice of faith or rebellion. It is therefore by character that some are fitted to destruction. Mr. Parry makes a point of safeguarding the expression 'Esau I hated' as being a quotation from the Old Testament, and therefore Jewish not Christian in its standpoint. We do not feel the need of being superior to the human language of St. Paul. All human analogies are inadequate, and hatred and anger alike express the opposition of the Divine holiness to human sin.

In viii 1–11 Mr. Parry interprets St. Paul's language about the quickening power of the Holy Spirit as referring to our present state as a new life, though not excluding the reference as usually understood to the Resurrection. The primary thought is that the human spirit is renewed by the Holy Spirit and enabled to mould and master the whole life. This is attractive as giving completeness to the contrast between the weakness of the law in face of the physical nature of man and the power of Christ, but involves understanding the expression 'our mortal bodies' (*v.* 11) as the equivalent of the expression in *v.* 10 'The body is dead because of sin.' There is no parallel for this use of *θνητός*, and Mr. Parry has to fall back on the use of the verb in c. vii 4.

1. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James.* By J. H. Ropes. 'International Critical Commentary.' (T. and T. Clark. 1916.) 9s. net.
2. *The Epistle of St. James. Lectures.* By H. Maynard Smith. (Oxford: B. H. Blackwell.) 6s.

In these two volumes there are represented the two opinions of the date of this Epistle. Canon Maynard Smith supports an

early date, whereas Mr. Ropes regards the Epistle as pseudonymous, and as dating from the end of the First century, or the beginning years of the Second. Those for whom he thinks the Epistle is intended were Greek-speaking Jewish Christians in Palestine. This last point involves the interpretation of 'the Dispersion' as a name for the Christian Church in the world. We agree with Dr. Knowling in regarding this as a forced meaning. The argument that the usual interpretation of the words involves serious grammatical difficulties, and is too violent to be permissible, is sufficiently met by Dr. Hort, when he says that the expression 'the twelve tribes' has nothing to do with the return or non-return of the different tribes from captivity. Mr. Ropes is inclined at times to be somewhat too literal.

While advocating this late date for the Epistle, Mr. Ropes decides that there is no proof that the writer was acquainted with, still less that he borrowed from, other New Testament writings. He declines to accept any suggestions of literary influence, and when dealing with the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* and the *Shepherd* draws the conclusion that they exhibit a common background of high Jewish morality. From this fact a further inference is made that they and St. Matthew's Gospel represent a different line of development from that of Hellenistic Christianity. We question very much whether there is evidence sufficient to warrant this conclusion, and much prefer to follow those who find in St. James' language evidence for an early date.

In another portion of the Introduction is a much more attractive study of the character of the Epistle, in which Mr. Ropes gives a considerable volume of evidence to illustrate the analogy between this work and the Greek diatribes, or popular moral addresses of the period. The parallel is well drawn out alike as regards subjects, method, comparisons, and modes of expression.

We do not quite understand why Mr. Ropes deemed it necessary to devote a considerable portion of his introduction to a discussion on the Brethren of the Lord, and the tradition of St. James. Having decided for a date that put the authorship of James the Lord's brother out of question, there seems little to be said for adding one more to the many contributions on the subject. He stands on the side of 'modern Protestant thought,' and declares the Epiphanian view to have its roots in 'the dogmatic assumptions of an ascetic theology, or at best in mere pious sentiments.'

Canon Maynard Smith's lectures are intended for general

reading, and were given to a mixed congregation at Malvern. They are carefully drawn up, and embody a good deal of church teaching. He is tempted to read a good deal of sacramental doctrine into the Epistle, seeking to shew it as underlying the language of St. James. Thus in his comments on i 18–21 there is much on the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and on the duties of renunciation, faith, and obedience; and in the same way in ii 1 'the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ' is regarded as the body of Christian doctrine, 'something which all the brethren knew and accepted.' We do not wish to be critical, for the book is in many ways admirably suited to its purpose, and should prove useful. We only wish to indicate its general character.

II. Philosophy of Religion.

God and Freedom in Human Experience. By C. F. D'Arcy, D.D., Bishop of Down. (Edward Arnold. 1915.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Bishop of Down's Donnellan Lectures are a very interesting and valuable contribution to the philosophical defence of Christianity. The author is well known from his previous writings as one of the most distinguished of those thinkers who have attempted to elaborate a Christian philosophy on an idealistic basis, and one of the most interesting features of the present work is the successful effort to bring religious idealism into relation with recent movements of thought. In particular Dr. D'Arcy has been impressed by the writings of M. Bergson and speaks of the 'transfiguration of idealism' which must result from the assimilation of Bergson's principles. He believes that we are on the eve of a new statement in theology in the light of this philosophical advance. The 'realistic' school on the other hand, as represented by Professor Alexander and Mr. Bertrand Russell, has no attractions for Dr. D'Arcy, who devotes a few pages to a severe and, as it seems to us, damaging criticism of their views. Dr. D'Arcy remains an idealist of the Berkeleyan type. Rejecting, however, the interpretation of Berkeley which regards 'the human mind as a kind of screen upon which a Divine operator throws a succession of images' he is led to the conception of the Absolute as a universal experience in which finite spirits share in a partial manner. Dr. D'Arcy does not, however, agree with that other exponent of Berkeleyan idealism,

Dr. Rashdall, in holding that God and the Absolute cannot be identified. In a discussion, which does not add very much to Lotze's classical argument but is nevertheless clearly stated, he urges that the Absolute must be at least personal. This strong insistence upon the significance of personality leads Dr. D'Arcy to dissent from those idealistic systems, represented by Mr. Bradley, which dismiss the category of selfhood as ultimately unreal. All criticism of the self, he urges, presupposes the affirmation of the self. It appears to us, however, that Dr. D'Arcy tends to exaggerate the difference between himself and the absolute idealists on this subject. It would be instructive if we could have a discussion as to the precise difference between the doctrine which holds that the Absolute is impersonal and yet allows that personality has a high degree of reality and the doctrine that the Absolute is personal and yet more than personal. It may be suspected that the difference would turn out to be largely a matter of emphasis.

Dr. D'Arcy has found considerable assistance in the philosophy of Bergson in dealing with the problem of evil. Retaining the view of the Absolute as that ultimate Reality in which contradictions are resolved, he bases upon it the argument that, although the problem of evil is not for us soluble, we have good ground for believing that it is not a contradiction inherent in the nature of things. But he considers himself justified in allowing at the same time an undeterminateness in the temporal order which has not generally been considered compatible with a thoroughgoing absolutism. Thus he rejects a complete 'finalism.' Events do not move according to a pre-determined plan. Only in outline and principle is the End pre-established. It is at this point that many readers will begin to feel difficulties and to wonder whether Dr. D'Arcy's idealism and Bergson's vitalistic voluntarism have really coalesced. We miss too a consideration of the objection that Bergson's doctrine of the impersonal *élan vital* is really fatal to personal freedom.

There are many valuable thoughts in this volum which we should have been glad to refer to at greater length. We must however draw attention to the admirable chapter on God and the World, which contains a useful attempt to give definite meaning to the somewhat vague term 'transcendence,' and to the clear and sensible chapter on 'Mysticism.' Dr. D'Arcy has remarked that Berkeley's reputation has suffered among philosophers by reason of his 'surprising orthodoxy.' Some reviews of this book that we have read suggest that Dr. D'Arcy is in danger

of the same fate. It is easy to insinuate that the author has used philosophy to bolster up a preconceived opinion, but we are convinced that anyone who approaches this book with no unphilosophical prejudice against received doctrines will be satisfied that Dr. D'Arcy has been prepared to follow the argument wherever it might lead him, and if his conclusions are in harmony with religious affirmations it is largely because he has taken account of facts which many professional philosophers are accustomed to ignore.

Immanence and Christian Thought. Implications and Suggestions. 'Fernley Lectures.' By FREDERIC PLATT, M.A., B.D. (C. H. Kelly.) 4*s*.

NOWHERE is the new way of Immanentism better set forth than in these Methodist Lectures. Mr. Platt may fairly be called orthodox: he discriminates with a sound intention where Mr. Campbell blundered badly. In his hands Immanentism is not a new religion, but a new persuasion to the old evangelical faith. Mr. Platt's Immanentism is a Christian Immanentism. Yet, even after reading these attractive lectures, doubts remain. It seems clear that the doctrine of Immanence is in fact, though not in intention, merely a symbolic way of bridging the distances of Time and Space. For God, however, those distances do not exist: all things are in Him, as thoughts are in the mind. Therefore His primary relation to the world of men and things cannot be one of Immanence. The conception of Immanence cannot be an ultimate foundation.

Mr. Platt attempts to purge the doctrine of Immanence from all taint of Pantheism, but it is far from clear that, if the purging were complete, there would remain anything that deserved a new name,—anything that would be the starting-point of a new departure either in Thought or in Life.

There is strong and repeated insistence that the thoughts of Immanentism yield very valuable results in Christian theology. All those results could be attained without conversion to the way of Immanentism.

Mr. Platt intends to safeguard the right faith as to the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. But, like so many moderns, he does not like that invaluable thing—metaphysical theology—and he prefers ethical to metaphysical terms when attempting to give some account of the union of God and Man in the One Theandric Person. But can He be present as an ethical

character or a will unless He be present personally, and, if He be present personally, is not His presence substantial and real? Therefore, an ethical presence is an unreal presence, or it presupposes a presence which cannot be described except in terms of being—that is, metaphysically.

The Problem of Evil. By ANGLICANUS. (Elliot Stock.) 1s.

THE author attempts to state anew 'the ancient Christian doctrine of evil.' 'All moral evil, all physical evil amongst men is the work of an enemy of all good,' and that enemy is not a principle, not merely a power, but a *person.* The conception is 'Scriptural' and it may be true. One thing is clear: it enables the author to do something which is most urgently and vitally necessary in these days—to set forth most strongly the separateness of the Christian life, the reality of the Christian warfare.

One may note in passing that the present European war is *not* 'the direct result of Nietzscheism.'

Nature and God discussed in Letters to a Questioner. By the Rev. T. A. LACEY. (S.P.C.K.) 1s.

IT is not often that Mr. Lacey reminds us of Pope, but for once he does. He thinks that what we call 'physical evil' seems to be evil only because we cannot see the plan of which it forms a part. As for moral evil, Mr. Lacey explains that as we all do. It is concomitant upon the freedom of man. The explanation is adequate so far as it goes, but it is one to which we cannot give more than a notional assent, and it really does little more than push the problem of evil farther back. It seems not impossible that a free spirit could have been so informed by the goodness of God from the start as to be indefectible. 'It is a delusion,' says Mr. Lacey, 'to suppose that miracles move us to believe in God; on the contrary, unless we believe in God, miracles have no meaning.' This is quite in the modern vein, but it is superficial. It puzzles Mr. Lacey to know how anyone who looks at the world at all can fail to believe in One Almighty God. 'I cannot understand how else you are to account for the universe, with its regular movements and forces. . . . The only way of starting movement that we know anything about lies in the action of a living being. . . . I am obliged to assume one supreme Will directing all.' This is adventurous but doubtful. It is

an effort of constructive imagination rather than a piece of sound thought. Why can we safely count on the regularity of Nature? Mr. Lacey tells us that 'things go regularly because of certain laws of Nature, composed by God the Creator.' This is old-fashioned in a bad sense. To find Mr. Lacey thus old-fashioned is a refreshing novelty. One thing in this little book is excellent. The author points out admirably that if the Christian religion brings evil into an unintended and concomitant relation with God, it also and distinctively sets God forth as the Healer and Saviour.

Nature, Miracle and Sin: A Study of St. Augustine's Conception of the Natural Order. Lectures delivered at Oxford. By the Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A. (Longmans.) 6*s.*

This book gives us Mr. Lacey at his best. A better introduction to the study of St. Augustine could hardly be desired. His publishers tell us that 'the aim of these lectures, delivered in the Schools at Oxford during the summer term of 1914, is to clear Saint Augustine from the charge of teaching the total depravity of human nature, and a Manichaean doctrine of evil.' That is true, but it is inadequate. The book has the unique distinction of being more than its publishers declare it to be. It helps us to trace the development of a great personality, to see how a master-mind assimilated the Faith and laid perduring foundations for Christian thought. It is an excellent piece of work.

Mr. Lacey, however, is a born controversialist. The lectures are marked by admirable self-restraint, but he has appended two papers which are strongly controversial. Dr. Sanday denies that miracles are *contra naturam*. Mr. Lacey agrees, but he adds the further denial that miracles are *supra naturam*. How does he reach this denial and what does he gain by it? He is able to reach it only by, in effect, treating 'Nature' as equivalent to 'Reality.' This equivalence, however, would be promptly and unreservedly rejected by many,—among others, by the present reviewer. Nature is not Reality, but Reality characterized in a certain way. Of course, if Nature be Reality, miracles cannot be either *supra* or *contra*. But when they are said to be either the one or the other, Nature is thought of, not as Reality, but as an aspect of Reality or Reality specifically characterized. It is thought of in fact as a dynamic complex of a physical or *quasi*-physical kind. Now, a Christian is bound to say that such a complex does not include the whole of Reality.

In some way or other, he must take up the physical complex into a larger universal order constituted by the purposeful operations of the Divine Will. This transcending of the physical complex, however, does not alter the relation of miracles to the complex which is thus transcended. It unifies miracles and natural law in a rational order which is larger than others, but the contrast between the two is unaffected.

What would Mr. Lacey say to Hobbes' definition of Miracle—'a work of God, beside His operation by the way of Nature'? Bishop Fleetwood, who thought that miracles were 'against the known course and settled Laws of Nature,' quoted Hobbes' definition, but did not notice the difference between 'beside' and 'against.'

Concerning Prayer, its Nature, its Difficulties, and its Value. By Various Writers. (Macmillan. 1916.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE national crisis and the Call to Repentance and Hope give this book a timeliness which will doubtless cause it to be widely read, but at any time it would be a book to be thankful for. It is not perhaps chiefly the conclusions at which the writers arrive which are so valuable—there is indeed no complete harmony of view—as the community of spirit which animates them. We have here the work of minds which are penetrated with the Christian faith, and find in the religious life their deepest interest, and yet are at the same time keenly alive to the intellectual movements of the day. They have written because they have been themselves unable to keep religion, in its narrower sense, and the wider life of the spirit in exclusion from one another.

Perhaps the first thing which strikes one who turns over the pages of this volume is the wide range of subjects which are brought under the general title. The problems of pain and of the nature of the devil lie only on the fringe of the difficulties connected with prayer, but the essays on these subjects are so excellent that we could not wish them absent. Canon Streeter who deals with 'God and the World's Pain' does not make any vain pretence of having a complete answer to the perplexities which centre round the existence of suffering. He urges merely that we find in the New Testament a 'provisional solution' which may be accepted by a rational faith. He does not admit that Christianity is a 'religion of suffering.' in the sense that pain is regarded as in itself good or is held to be necessarily from God. On the contrary mere suffering is

conceived as evil. It may however acquire a purgatorial efficacy if accepted in the true spirit, and, by its transformation into spiritual values in the personality of the sufferer, may be an occasion of inspiration to others. Canon Streeter swims into deeper waters when he concludes his essay by a reference to suffering as an element in the Divine Experience. In our opinion he is right in arguing that such a conclusion follows from the affirmation that Christ is 'the portrait of the invisible God,' and he is certainly right in thinking that here we have a practical escape from the really intolerable situation which is created by the belief that God is completely impassible. The suspicion of 'Patripassianism' which may attach to such a view is avoided by the thought that, though suffering enters as a real element into the Divine Experience, it is as overcome and transformed into victory. Here undoubtedly a difficulty arises which remains in a sense insoluble, for we cannot conceive how suffering which is truly transcended should retain nevertheless the full nature of suffering. Some readers will possibly be startled by Canon Streeter's discussion of the consequences which might have followed had our Lord lived to a ripe old age, and by his suggestion that this might well have happened, given a very slight change in historical conditions. This would involve a view of the Atonement which would require careful scrutiny if the suggestion were made in connexion with that doctrine, but we do not understand Canon Streeter to have any such intention, and in its context the hypothesis appears both reverent and relevant. The essay contains no thoughts which are new. That would indeed be difficult at this period in man's long grappling with the subject, but it is written with a force and persuasiveness that give it a real claim to originality.

The same author has also contributed a very valuable paper on Worship, in which he makes good use of psychological results. Worship consists essentially in self-dedication to the Highest; and corporate worship is essential to the fullness of this experience. But, in many instances, church services are not adapted to perform their true function. 'There is something to be said for the view that it is good for young people occasionally to submit to being bored; there is nothing to be said for the widespread practice of using Church services for this purpose.' Canon Streeter insists on the importance of variety as a means of assisting the attention, and complains, with great justice, that the current types of service give little place to silent waiting upon God. His advocacy of freer services and of the

revival of extempore prayer will probably not win universal approval, but we are convinced that many parish priests are becoming aware that in some cases at least changes of this kind are necessary in order to liberate the spirit of devotion which is too often smothered by the soothing routine of our Prayer-Book worship.

We must pass over with a brief notice Dr. Rufus Jones' essay on Prayer and the Mystic Vision, not because it is not excellent, but because to deal with it adequately would require a survey of the whole subject of mysticism and its significance. The paper is a model of compression and lucidity. We note with pleasure that Dr. Jones protests against the attempt to make the special type of mystical piety a norm for all spiritual life. 'We must not come under the spell of the outworn thought forms, and motor-habits through which the great mystics attempted to utter themselves. The well-marked, sharply defined "mystic way" which many mystics of the past have taken is esoteric and more or less artificial, not grounded in the inherent nature of the soul and not a universal highway for the whole race of the saved, though even here the experience of mystics, as a typical pilgrim's progress, may be and often is illuminating. The ladders of mystical ascent must be treated as parables of the way upward rather than as literal rungs and necessary stages of religious experience, and one feels how artificial they are when an attempt is made to fit the mighty life-experience of Christ and St. Paul into these mystical model forms and to make *them* follow the "purgative," the "illuminative" and the "unitive" stages.'

Mr. Edwyn Bevan writes upon some theoretical difficulties of prayer in a short but valuable essay. He takes the view that petition is of the essence of prayer and differentiates it from worship in general. In this Mr. Bevan differs from the position which is taken, or appears to be taken, by some of the other contributors. Thus, so far as we have been able to understand Mr. Harold Anson's discussion of Prayer as Understanding, he suggests that the essence of prayer is 'placing our spirit in harmony with God's purpose' which is practically identical with the definitions which Canon Streeter and Mr. Bevan give of worship in general. This essay of Mr. Anson's is perhaps the least satisfactory in the book. He has some amusing though rather obvious remarks about the 'sultanic' conception of God, but his main theme is the development of a supposed analogy between prayer and natural science. We confess that the precise

point of this analogy has escaped us, and we cannot help thinking that the differences between the attitude of the student of nature and that of the soul engaged in prayer are far more fundamental than the resemblances. Mr. Anson is also responsible for an interesting paper on Prayer and Bodily Health in which he has some wise thoughts on the danger incurred by 'spiritual healers' of ignoring the patent evil of the world.

The longest and in many respects the most important essay is that on 'Faith, Prayer and the World's Order' by Mr. A. C. Turner. It contains much that is profoundly thought and beautifully said, but the impression left by it as a whole is far from clear. Perhaps this was inevitable, since the full discussion of the questions raised would involve the elaboration of a cosmic theory. But it does not seem inevitable that Mr. Turner should leave us with a confused notion as to what, in his view, is the purpose and efficacy of prayer. Thus he begins by stating that if 'prayer has a body' it follows that 'things are made to happen otherwise than by natural causation.' He rejects however the proposal to explain the efficacy of prayer on the lines of telepathy as leading to a crudely magical conception. The world, he tells us, is both spiritual and natural, but these two orders are not separate from one another, but aspects of the same Reality. Spiritual Reality is not however actualized in the phenomenal order and the prayer of faith is a means of coming into contact with the Spiritual Order. We may remark that some distinction at least seems implied between the Spiritual and the Natural and that the thought of calling in spiritual 'forces' to modify the natural order has at least a partial validity, if prayer is indeed efficacious in 'causing things to happen.' But Mr. Turner has a strong objection to the use of such language, and the following passage from the conclusion of the essay suggests that his view is more closely akin to a purely 'subjective' theory than perhaps he himself is aware.

'Prayer is not a substitute or an addition to the machinery of the world's forces. . . . Nor yet is it a passive supplication that our ends may be accomplished "if God wills." Its purpose is that man may know what God wills and, if dreams are shattered, may find among the ruins some greater good. The secret of prayer is less in the attainment of ends desired than in the discovery in the wreck of desires unfulfilled of some flaw in the design, some truer version that may rise above the world's obduracy: or else some way of turning pain to active and remedial patience of outward evil.'

We feel the truth and the beauty of this passage, but we feel too that the real question which we want to ask has not been answered. Still at the end as at the beginning the question comes 'Has prayer a body?' Is it the occasion of the production of events otherwise than by 'natural' causes? There is too a vein of agnosticism in Mr. Turner's thought which his allusive and metaphorical style makes it difficult to estimate with any certainty. 'Faith,' he tells us, 'can never do more than build an imaginary and poetic structure round this scaffold' (erected by Science). Again, 'The effect of the entry of scientific knowledge into the world is to turn spiritual faith back upon its true task, which is not to explain or expound the past, but to create the future.' If this means no more than that a symbolic element necessarily enters into any detailed conception of the Divine Nature and its relation into the world we have merely a harmless commonplace, but if it is suggested that there is no basis for Theology at least as valid as the fundamental assumptions of Science we have a position which must in the long run be fatal to religious belief. Mr. Turner's own essay proceeds on the hypothesis that it is possible to give rational grounds for the belief that the 'scaffold' of natural science does not exhaust the truth about Reality, and that a deeper consideration shews that the Spiritual is more 'real' than the natural. This basic theology is not surely in any strict sense 'poetical' or 'imaginative,' and it is clear that it must affect our attitude towards experience as a whole, the past and present as well as the future.

We should like to dwell on other papers in this volume, but we must be content with indicating their existence. The author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia* writes attractively on Repentance and Prayer for the Dead. Mr. C. H. S. Matthews is interesting and sensible on the subject of the Eucharist from the standpoint of religious experience. Mr. Micklem gives the Nonconformist view of sacraments and remarks that for protestant nonconformity the sermon is the 'elevation of the Host,' a statement which we can only record with respectful amazement.

Deliverance. [*The Freeing of the Spirit in the Ancient World.*] By H. O. Taylor, Litt.D. (Macmillan.) 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

The task the author of this work sets himself is well expressed in the Prologue; it is 'to attempt some ordering and statement of the ways in which our spiritual ancestors of all times and countries adjusted themselves to the fears and hopes of their

natures, thus reaching a freedom of action in which they accomplished their lives.'

The struggle for this adjustment, which brings deliverance and peace, was begun by the ancient peoples of Mesopotamia and Egypt. From this attempted adjustment, the writer proceeds to deal with those great thinkers and 'Saviours' of the past, who illustrate most clearly phases of human adjustment with life. There is the *vita contemplativa* of Lao Tzu; the *vita activa* of Confucius; 'the Mary and Martha of China.'

In India there was the desire for emancipation from recurrent death; and the adjustment consisted in the annihilation of individuality—the Buddhist Nirvana. The Prophet of Iran, Zarathushtra, found his deliverance in a direct personal trust in Mazda, and the freedom to fight for the faith in which he trusted. The writer then turns to the Prophets of Israel, and in some detail traces the adjustment from David to the rise of the Apocalyptic Literature. 'The Heroic Adjustment in Greek Poetry' next claims his attention; and this in turn is followed by the 'Greek Philosophers' special stress being laid upon the adjustment attempted by Plato—'the complete and beautiful perfecting of the soul.' The period between the Greek Philosophers and the birth of Christ is bridged over by the 'Intermediaries,' the Neo-Platonists receiving special attention. There is then a short chapter on Jesus, where adjustment takes on the deeper meaning of assurance and salvation through the life of Christ. St. Paul's adjustment is summed up in his teaching on justification by faith, which according to the writer means the spirit of Christ in the believer. An analysis of the teaching of St. Augustine, tracing the various stages in his adjustment, which finally reached out to 'eternal life'—completes the survey.

Man's need of the *best* is held to be the impelling truth underlying all these adjustments; but as a *religious adjustment* Christianity is final.

The writer reveals a wide range of learning, deep spiritual insight, and a genuine sympathy with each of the great Fathers whose spiritual offspring we are.

The Philosophy of Religion. 'International Theological Library.' By GEORGE GALLOWAY, D.Phil., D.D. (T. and T. Clark.) 12*s.* net.

THIS is the most comprehensive work of its kind in the English language; and it is indispensable to the student of the Philosophy

of Religion. The volume is divided into three parts. Part I treats of the Nature and Development of Religion in a most exhaustive fashion. In two hundred pages almost every aspect of the Psychical Basis of Religion, the Beginnings and Growth of Religion, and the Characteristic Aspects of Developed Religion, receives skilful handling. Part II deals with the Problem of Knowledge and its validity; the author keeping the balance between Pragmatism and Intellectualism. Part III is concerned with the ultimate Truth of Religion, and Dr. Galloway defends the position of God as the World-Ground, Who is Personal and Ethical.

The admirable arrangement of the book into chapters with paragraphs, and the adequate bibliography, render the whole work invaluable for reference as well as for systematic study.

Confucianism and its Rivals. 'Hibbert Lectures.' Second Series, 1914. By HERBERT A. GILES, LL.D., Professor of Chinese in the University of Cambridge. (Williams and Norgate.) 6*s.* net.

THESE Lectures were delivered in the University Hall of Dr. Williams' Library, London, in October, November and December 1914. They embody an attempt to exhibit chronologically the principles and practices adopted by Confucius as a heritage from antiquity and subsequently handed down through twenty-four centuries, with certain modifications, until the present day. The work is largely historical in character; the religious history of China being traced from the year 3000 B.C. to 1915 A.D. It is interesting to notice that Dr. Giles finds no evidence to support Sir J. G. Frazer's theory that magic is the precursor of religion; nor was religion in China weakened by the 'admixture of science.' In the beginning there was a pure monotheism of a personal God, who was gradually displaced by the Confucian system. Confucius himself believed in a Supreme Being, but he always used T'ien (God Passive Abstract) in preference to Shang Ti (God Active Personal). Confucius was not 'a mere moral philosopher,' although he laid great stress on the service of man rather than the direct service to God. The preservation of Confucianism was largely due to Mencius, 'the St. Paul of Confucianism but without the garnish.' The subsequent conflict of Confucianism with its rivals—Taoism, Buddhism, Mazdaism etc.—and lastly with Christianity is worked out in a masterly fashion. Dr. Giles states the three real

difficulties to Christianity (1) the Confucian dogma that man is born good, (2) ancestral worship, which he holds to be inconsistent with Christianity, (3) rules and practice of filial piety. The Chinese Republic is crying out for a State Religion and the writer suggests a return to the old unitarian worship of 4000 years ago, but with the battle cry: 'There is no God but God (T'ien) and Confucius is His Prophet.' Many of us hope for something better.

III. Patristic Texts.

1. *Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum auctore Tyrannio Rufino Aquileiensi presbytero.* Edited by E. F. Morison, D.D., Incumbent of Rosslyn Chapel. (Methuen. 1916.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

2. *A Commentary on the Apostles' Creed, by Tyrannius Rufinus, Presbyter of Aquileia.* Translated by E. F. Morison, D.D. (Methuen. 1916.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

A new edition of Heurtley's *De Fide et Symbolo* with better texts, a select critical apparatus and a companion volume of notes has long been a need of English theological students. It would be rather troublesome, but with co-operation not at all impossible, to make within a reasonable time, and its usefulness would probably compensate for the labour involved; for it is not everyone who has large editions of the Fathers or even Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole* always at hand or can afford to buy them for himself. The suggestion of a companion volume is prompted by reading Dr. Morison's notes to his new edition of Rufinus' *Commentary on the Apostles' Creed.* His text is a reprint of that of Vallarsi published in 1745 with a few emendations. His notes are those of a learned man who has read much, but unless we do him unintentional injustice, has had little experience of teaching. Some of them are extremely good and suggestive, but a large number presuppose an amount of previous knowledge and a breadth of education in the student which few are likely to possess; and though it may be an advantage to be able to prophesy certain disaster to the type of student who endeavours to learn them by heart it would be a greater service to be able by spreading the notes over a larger field and omitting minuter comments and illustrations to familiarize students with the great ideas underlying technical terms and to elucidate their

meaning and development in such a way that learning comes by thinking as well as by memory.

We speak with some hesitation on the matter, but it would probably have been better where the text is practically a reprint to reserve an emendation for the notes. Thus in chapter xiii the note is : ' ab solutione vacare, al. ad solutionem vocare, an easier reading. Perhaps we might read nec illud quidem ab solutione hujus quaestionis omittamus without vacare, which seems to be superfluous.' And so we read accordingly in the text not the form commented upon but the emendation ; and cannot help wondering a little at this summary method of disposing of difficulties while leaving the fact of their existence unexplained. At the end of chapter vi the note would be more helpful if it recorded the additional sentences contained in some MSS as to which we are told that the Migne edition regards them as a gloss, but not what they are.

The introduction is short but good and less cramped than the notes. Dr. Morison holds that ' though in intellect and scholarship [Rufinus] was much inferior to Jerome, yet we can see that he was in many ways a nobler and finer character.' Of the former statement there can be no doubt ; as to the latter we doubt the capacity of human judgement for a comparative estimate of moral excellence as exhibited by mediocrity and genius, and will be content to differ without argument, while conceding that the blessed Hierome must have been a gey ill person to live with. Of the translation it is sufficient to say that a large part of it could be read with pleasure by a person of literary tastes who did not know Latin ; and that if occasionally it lacks flexibility that is only a difficulty which we have all of us experienced and not always overcome. Sometimes it might be even nearer to the Latin order with advantage : *e.g.* at the outset ' de Deo etiam vera dicere periculosum est,' where every word tells, loses much when it becomes ' it is dangerous to speak of God even what is true.'

The Commonitorium of Vincentius of Lerins. Edited by R. S. Moxon, B.D. ' Cambridge Patristic Texts.' (Cambridge University Press. 1915.) 9*s.* net.

It is a very strange thing that Mr. Moxon, the Headmaster of Lincoln School, to whom we owe this book, should be able to write that while ' translations there are in plenty . . . no edition of any critical value has ever been published in this country.'

Strange because the 'richt goldin buke,' as Ninian Winzeit called it, is one of the best known of all theological treatises, and stranger still because the four manuscripts upon which we have now to depend are all collected in one place and that a place so accessible and delightful to students as the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Indeed there appears to be only one other critical text in existence—that published by Rauschen at Bonn ten years ago. The *editio princeps* of Iohannes Sichardus published at Basle in 1528 was based on a MS perhaps derived from Lorsch and now lost, but apparently of no great value, and the Seventeenth-century editions of Baluze usually reproduced in later texts, *e.g.* those of Gallandi, Migne, and Hurter, though based on fuller MS authority, leave a good deal to be desired, as anyone may see who studies with care the *apparatus criticus* of Rauschen or Moxon. For this reason we cannot but regret that, presumably on account of war-prices, it should not have been possible to publish this text except at a price which is half as much again as that of Prebendary Fausset's edition of Novatian *De Trinitate* in the same series—an excellent piece of work but one which could not possibly appeal to so wide a circle of students.

The *Commonitorium* has suffered much from the ingenuity of its editors and we are not sure that even Mr. Moxon has not yielded too easily in one or two cases to the seduction of a palmary emendation; but the general impression left by the study of his text and notes is that they are admirably constructed with a view to the interests of others besides scholars. This is a point of real importance, for if our system of theological training is worth anything on its intellectual side the student of to-day is being fitted to be the thinker and scholar and teacher of to-morrow, and those who decry the study of patristic texts as a 'soft option' for examination purposes in comparison with ethics or comparative religion or sociology—whatever that may be supposed to mean—forget that the training in scientific and historical method derivable from a careful investigation of the history, relations, content and form of a great work which has exercised a considerable influence on the development of thought may provide an invaluable organon for dealing with unorganized materials and pseudo-scientific generalizations in other fields. In his Introduction, Mr. Moxon discusses, in addition to the critical questions to which we have referred and the cognate questions of authorship, latinity, style and Biblical text, the meaning and application of the famous canon 'teneamus

quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est' with the explanations and limitations proposed to it by Cardinal Franzelin and others, and also the relation of Vincentius to Augustinianism, and of his work to the *Quicumque vult*, which is attributed to Caesarius of Arles. It is impossible to do justice to these discussions in a short notice, especially since they involve matters as to which a wide difference of opinion is possible. In regard to the question of direct reference in the work to Augustine's teaching Mr. Moxon seems to us to speak with rather greater definiteness in his notes than in his Introduction; and frankly while not excluding the possibility we find it very difficult to believe that there is really any reference intended in some of the passages in which it is discovered. Unfortunately we feel this most strongly in what is regarded as a crucial passage:

'Audent polliceri et docere quod *in ecclesia sua, id est, in communionis suae conuenticulo*, magna et specialis ac plane personalis quaedam sit dei gratia, adeo ut sine ullo labore, sine ullo studio, sine ulla industria, etiamsi nec petant nec quaerant nec pulsent, quicumque illi ad numerum suum pertinent, tamen ita diuinitus dispensentur ut . . . numquam possint . . . scandalizari.'

This is the language in which an ecclesiastical writer of the present day might allow himself in a moment of irritation to refer to members of a different school of thought; but while the letter of Prosper to Augustine §4 and Augustine's *De Dono Perseuerantiae* §64 make it most probable that the collocation 'petant . . . quaerant . . . pulsent' is not fortuitous but involves a direct reference to some body of persons we will venture to maintain with a conviction amounting practically to certainty that nowhere in Latin patristic literature can there be found a case of a writer careful or otherwise of his reputation for orthodoxy—and Vincentius was very jealous of his—venturing to refer to the church of Augustine in such language as that which we have italicized. It is less unlikely, to put it no higher, to be a 'dig' at Prosper of Aquitaine or Hilary.

The freedom of editors in emendation seems sometimes to have proceeded from an excessive literalness of interpretation and a neglect to allow for the highly rhetorical and artificial style of the *Commonitorium*. There is nothing really strange in 'Sed tempus' (3.5), taking up 'sed etiam consideratio temporis' in the line before. In 68.6,7 the reference may be to suffering 'on behalf of the Name,' the 'dominicae confessionis' being epexegetic. In the quotation from St. Ambrose on p. 19 'ausi rudes' is tempting in view of the 'ausi . . . non ausi' below,

but perhaps temerarious ; and on p. 26.6,7 an emendation which would account for all difficulties, if the construction be possible, is ' sola . . causae . . destituisset.' On p. 80.13 we feel highly suspicious of the compound ' perauolant ' of which there is no other instance and no special force. *Query* ' excutitur ab *area*, quod nullo pondere intra *aream* tenebatur. Namque alii ilico prorsus per *aera* uolant (or auolant).' But this is merely to give hostages ourselves. On p. 10 for ' nor inherited ' read ' and did not inherit ' ; p. 38 read ' the artificial Christology of *Valentinus* ' for the sake of the stupid or the unwary ; p. 76 *De Apellis gnosis monarchia* is curious.

IV. Sermons and Devotional Studies.

The Ideals of the Prophets : Sermons by the late S. R. Driver, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Together with a Bibliography of his published writings. (Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark. 1915.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

These twenty Discourses have been well chosen, and the volume happily named (from the title of Sermon IX, on Isaiah xxxv 1), by Dr. Driver's successor, Canon G. A. Cooke. A few had been previously printed and others marked for publication by their author. They represent a ministry of thirty-two years, from Driver's ordination in 1882 to his death in February 1914 : he was spared the War. There are very few indications of date ; and it would have been an advantage, in some cases, to know when the various sermons were written. For example one wonders whether Dr. Driver would have expounded Malachi i 11[1] as confidently as he has done (God ' accepts the imperfect homage of the Gentiles . . . in preference to the service of His own people ') after the discovery of the Elephantiné Papyri revealing the existence, in Malachi's own time, of a Jewish Temple at Yeb.

The Sermons shew the famous scholar at his best as an expositor, with his learning, his lucidity, his loyalty to Holy Writ and the use made of it by its witness and keeper the Church. As Dr. Cooke truly says, in his admirable Preface, this preacher had an ' unerring perception of the essential things.' [2]

Illustrative treatment of the sort valued by some sermon-hearers is rare, and it is unnecessary,—so interesting is the

[1] P. 125. [2] P. viii.

exposition itself. But it is a pleasure to find such touches as that shewing Driver's appreciation of Sebastian Wesley and Goss[1]; and probably few of his hearers had ever been aware of the exact reproduction of 'the melodious movement of the Homeric hexameter' in Isaiah xiv 12, E.V.[2] The closing Sermon, on the Authorized Version, was preached in the tercentenary year 1911; and several topical allusions would interest Oxford people, *e.g.* the origin of 'Canterbury Quad'[3] and the story of Wolsey's messengers interrupting Evensong at Christ Church in order to arrest heretics.[4]

The Bibliography, covering twenty-five pages, is a welcome addition to a delightful book. It is the work of Mr. G. R. Driver, who gives a chronological list of his father's published writings from 1871 to 1915 (two being posthumous). Other Appendices give the main events in Dr. Driver's life, and a list of Obituary notices. Some readers will note with pleasure that the great scholar was a lover of animals, being appointed Vice-President of the Anti-Vivisection Society in 1913.

A Prophet's Visions and the War: a Message of Repentance and Hope, based on Zechariah I–VIII, and linked with the National Mission. By the Rev. T. W. CRAFER, D.D., Vicar of All Saints', Cambridge; Chaplain and Lecturer at Downing College. (Skeffington. 1916.) 2*s.* net.

An Interpreter of War, Habakkuk. Addresses delivered in St. Margaret's, Westminster. By the Rev. GEOFFREY GORDON, M.A. (Longmans. 1916.) 1*s.* net.

DR. CRAFER is not ashamed to be popular and ingenious; to liken the four horns and the four smiths of Zechariah's prophecy to the two groups of nations now at war; to compare the flying roll of the divine curse with a Zeppelin. Nor has he any subtle doubt concerning our duty to fight to a finish, and 'to make the British Empire a praise in the whole earth.' On the other hand he is not afraid to speak plainly about national sins, and to declare how far we still are from realizing our need of humiliation. The Church is to him the representative of God in the midst of an as yet unhallowed nation; and from Zechariah he sets out the hard but high task of the Church in England, to inaugurate a movement back to God whereby all the nations in the world shall become one in Christ Jesus.

[1] P. 81. [2] P. 93. [3] P. 196. [4] P. 199.

Mr. Gordon passes lightly over the more obvious parallels between the period of Habakkuk and our own, and concentrates attention on his attitude to the problem of God's government of the world.

> 'Religious and political antecedents had combined to produce in Habakkuk the questioning mind. He had attained to a very high conception of God, and it always happens that, the higher the faith in God, the greater the difficulty that is presented by the vicissitudes of human experience.'

That is the essential parallel. For, 'like Habukkuk, we in England are the heirs of a very remarkable period. . . . Our conception of God has received from prophets of the past,' Wesley, the Tractarians, Maurice, Westcott, 'an immense moral and spiritual uplifting.' Hence the peculiar character and intensity of our national sin, and the special insistency with which the problem of God's governance is presented to us. In Habakkuk we see 'a prophet in the making.' Moral abasement at home and a fierce power triumphant in the world brought to him perplexity, then trust, then a twofold revelation. First he received divine vision of the far future:

> 'Oppressed by the tragedy of the present, the growing power of the Chaldæans, he has taken a longer view, and in the slow processes of history he sees the handiwork of God, the inevitable decadence of evil, the assured vitality of good.'

Then he received the still diviner vision of peace in God even in the midst of ruin: 'The student of history thinks in millions, but the revelation of the character of God is a help to those who think only in ones.' That was the process by which Habakkuk found his place in the select company of Old Testament prophets. Now 'every Christian is potentially a prophet,' and the analogous conditions of to-day may produce very many prophets by a like process of education. Through such obscure but associated agents God may lead a nation to repentance and hope.

We gladly recommend this unpretending, thoughtful little book.

The Lord in His Temple: The Message of Habakkuk to a World at War. By H. P. Denison, Vicar of St. Michael and All Angels, North Kensington, Prebendary of Wells. (Robert Scott. 1916.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

Prebendary Denison's exposition of Habakkuk is very stimulating and is full of thought.

Someone said the other day that the 'Old Testament has come to its own during the war.' The prophet Habakkuk has had attractions for two writers quite lately. Prebendary Denison's thoughts should be read, and especially by Church people who in their zeal to avoid 'Huppim, Muppim and Ard' have somewhat neglected the Old Testament of late years.

Father Stanton's Last Sermons in St. Alban's, Holborn. Edited with a Preface by the Rev. E. F. Russell, M.A. Fifth Edition. (Hodder and Stoughton. 1916.) 5s. net.

Teh sermons in this volume belong to the last few years of Father Stanton's ministry. They are verbatim reports by Miss C. Ross, a shorthand writer commissioned by Sir W. R. Nicoll, and exhibit the whole general mind of the preacher on the great truths of religion throughout the Christian year,—his bold plain preaching of the Gospel, with his uncompromising outspoken expression of Catholic Faith and practice. The sermons provide a satisfactory answer to a question which naturally presents itself to anyone acquainted with the influence which Father Stanton exercised. Why was it that hundreds of men came to his feet whenever he was announced to preach, that St. Alban's was filled with those wonderful Monday evening congregations in Advent and Lent, that his funeral caused a hush in the busy roar of the London streets, if it did not 'eclipse the gaiety of nations'? Some part of the answer of course must be sought in the speaker's remarkable presence and personality, in his face and voice and grace of manner, in the apparently easy, spontaneous fluency of his natural eloquence. But here in the printed page, the matter of his sermons makes a larger contribution to the answer than the manner of the spoken word. And we cannot doubt that Father Russell has touched the heart of the matter when he speaks 'above all' of 'the glowing personal love for the Lord Jesus Christ, which streamed through all' that Father Stanton said. We hope that the clergy will study these sermons. They deserve to be studied rather than imitated, for they are samples of a unique and incommunicable style, and one fact mentioned in the preface ought to be well laid to heart, that at the back of this facile eloquence there lay thirty years of unrelaxing preparation, not of great reading, but of much thinking, noted down with deliberation and care in six quarto volumes, containing more or less elaborated outlines of more than a thou-

sand sermons. He owed much, we are told, to the sermons of Phillips Brooks, Spurgeon, and Dr. Parker, and we note as special marks of his style his use of plain words, short sentences, and verses of poetry usually expressive of the simpler emotions of the heart.

V. History.

The Archbishops of St. Andrews. Vol. v. By John Herkless and R. K. Hannay. (Blackwood. 1916.) *7s. 6d.* net.

Principal Herkless and Mr. Hannay have now completed their melancholy task. They have told, fully and clearly, the discreditable story of the Archbishops of St. Andrews. From 1472, when the see was raised by a Papal bull to metropolitan rank, to 1571, when John Hamilton was hanged, it had eight occupants, not one of whom exhibited the qualities demanded by his office, though there was promise in Alexander Stewart, the pupil of Erasmus, who fell at Flodden by his father's side, a boy of twenty and an Archbishop of nine years' standing. John Hamilton, the last of the line, carried on its most secular traditions. A bastard of the great house of Hamilton and brother of the Regent who governed Scotland most incapably during the childhood of Mary, he was provided by the Pope to the rich Abbey of Paisley at fourteen, and early entered on a political life. He held high office under his brother, and two days after the murder of Archbishop Beaton was rewarded with the temporalities of St. Andrews. He came into full possession, after the usual negotiations with Rome, in 1549. The Reformation was beginning in Scotland, and it was hoped that he would favour it. More than once, in fact, he shewed symptoms of a willingness to compromise. There were but two burnings during his episcopate; and his theology, as shewn in the famous Catechism that bears his name, is of a High Anglican type which won Mr. Gladstone's approval. In a statement of the faith which professes to be complete the Pope is not even mentioned. But it is not likely that the Archbishop contributed more to the work than the cost of printing it. The Catechism was published by a provincial council under Hamilton's presidency, and was designed to reconcile the reformers. The hope was vain. Two years after the council, in 1554, the Regent fell from office and with him his brother, who lost the post of Treasurer of Scotland.

Then events moved swiftly. In 1557 Protestant worship was openly held, and the image of St. Giles of Edinburgh was drowned and burnt. In 1560 a last attempt was made to stay the tide. Another provincial council was held, which passed a comprehensive series of canons in which all the evils of the Church were confessed and denounced. Among these was the existence of 'concubinarii' among the clergy, and there has never been a more terrible humiliation than that to which the Archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow submitted when they publicly confessed their fault and announced that they had put themselves under spiritual direction with the purpose of amendment. The case of the Primate of Scotland was notorious; he had at least six children by one or more mistresses. There is no reason to suppose that he changed his habits. In the same year came the return of Knox and the revolution, when the nation accepted a new doctrine and a new constitution for its Church. In the Parliament at which these were carried through the prelates were present, but they were silent. No public protest was made on behalf of the ancient order, and the reformers did not fail to taunt its adherents with this confession that it was indefensible. In spite of the refusal of Mary to assent to this legislation the new system was established, and her struggles against it had no success. The Archbishop still sat in Parliament as holder of the estates of his see and abbey, and took an active part in the politics of his time. But it was as a Hamilton rather than as an Archbishop; his loyalty to his family was not weakened by his brother's secession to the side of reform. When, in 1567, Mary was deposed and Moray made Regent on behalf of her infant son, the cause of the old Church was finally lost. The reforming laws were re-enacted, and now royal sanction was given in a form that could only be impugned by a revolution which could not possibly be achieved. Even had the Hamiltons succeeded in overthrowing Moray, to reinstate themselves during the minority of James, the old system could not have been revived; nor could Mary, had she returned from England, have restored it. And in fact the Hamiltons, so far as they took Mary's side, were fighting for their own hand as much as for her. It is no wonder that Mary's flight was quickly followed by the Archbishop's condemnation in absence as a traitor; and it was quite in conformity with Scottish custom that Moray, the rival of his house, should be assassinated by a Hamilton, the Archbishop's nephew. It was inevitable that, when they had

their opportunity, his enemies should hang the last Archbishop of St. Andrews, of the first succession, as they did on April 7, 1571. He died confessing himself a loyal member of his Church; and in his later years the Popes, seeing in him one of the few supports of their cause, had used strangely laudatory language towards him, though they knew well what was his manner of life. Yet he had become, even from the Roman point of view, an anachronism; for Rome, as much as reforming Scotland, had begun to be in earnest about religion. The story is told by the learned authors with the same gravity and impartiality as in their earlier volumes; and if English readers may still be embarrassed by the knowledge of Scottish affairs and locutions that is required, they will find that this important work has gained in life and vigour of style as it has advanced to its successful conclusion.

Periodicals.

The Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. XVIII. No. 69. October 1916. Milford). H. B. Swete: 'The Faithful Sayings.' H. D. A. Major: 'Aionios. Its Use and Meaning especially in the N.T.' W. E. Barnes: 'The Text of Ps. ii 12.' H. L. Jackson: 'The Death of John, son of Zebedee.' A. Wright: 'Was Judas Iscariot "the First of the Twelve"?' A. Sloman: '"Blessed are the Poor in Spirit." Matt. v 3, *cf.* Luke vi 20.' L. E. Binns: 'The Syrian Campaign of Necho II.' W. H. Frere: 'The Carolingian *Gregorianum*. Its Sections and their Numbering.' R. H. Connolly, O.S.B.: (1) 'The Ordination Prayers of Hippolytus'; (2) '*Te decet hymnus*.' W. E. Barnes: 'Revision of the Prayer Book Psalter.' G. L. Marriott: (1) 'The Lausiac History of Palladius and a Homily ascribed to Macarius of Egypt'; (2) 'The Seven Homilies of Macarius in Florilegia'; (3) 'Symeon Metaphrastes and the Seven Homilies of Macarius of Egypt.' A. Souter: 'Quotations from the Epistles of St. Paul in St. Hilary on the Psalms.' H. Smith: 'Notes on Origen and Eusebius.' H. F. Stewart: '*Concerning Prayer*' and 'McNeile *Self-Training in Prayer*.' J. K. Mozley: 'Caillard *The Church and the New Knowledge*.' J. F. B[ethune-]B[aker]: '*New Tracts on the Creed*' (critical); 'W. K. L. Clarke *St. Gregory of Nyssa Life of St. Macrina*' and 'Hitchcock *St. Irenaeus Against the Heresies*' (favourable). W. E. Barnes: 'Hühn-Salvatorelli *La Bibbia*.' G. N. L. Hall: 'F. Legge *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*' (unequal). T. H. Bindley: 'Morison *Rufinus on the Apostles' Creed*.' J. H. A. Hart: 'S. C. Kirkpatrick *Through the Jews to God*.'

The Hibbert Journal (Vol. XV. No. 1. October 1916. Williams and Norgate). J. P. Bang: 'The Root of the Matter' (with an Appendix translated from the 'National Evangelical Lutheran Church Times' attacking 'an Englishman, an Archbishop [of Canterbury] of this murderous people'). A. S. Ferguson: 'More German Sermons.' C. F. Thwing: 'The American Civil War and the Present War. A Comparison.' W. Lock: 'The Literary Method of the Fourth Gospel.' J. E. Carpenter:

'The Theology of the Rev. Stopford Brooke.' C. A. Mercier: 'Are we Happier than our Forefathers?' C. Moxon: 'The Modernist Revival of Anglicanism.' L. B. Paton: 'Assyria and Prussia. An Historical Parallel.' G. Dennis: 'Immortal Poland.' J. W. Scott: 'The Distrust of the Intellect.' H. T. Hodgkin: 'Christian Internationalism.' Discussions. G. D. Hicks: 'Survey of Recent Philosophical Literature.' L. P. Jacks: 'G. G. Armstrong *Our Ultimate Aim in the War*' (5 pp.). C. D. Burns: '*The Problem of the Commonwealth.*' S. A. Cook: 'Jordan *Comparative Religion, its Adjuncts and Allies*' (4 pp.). F. C. S. Schiller: 'Jacks *Mad Shepherds, From the Human End, Philosophers in Trouble.*' W. H. Burgess: 'Whitley *Works of John Smyth of Christ's* (1594–8).'

The Dublin Review (Vol. CLIX. No. 319. October 1916. Burns and Oates). (The late) Wilfrid Ward: 'Memories and Reflections.' S. Leslie: 'The Irish Scene in American Eyes.' C. C. Martindale, S.J.: 'Reconstruction. An Echo from the War Literature.' H. Pope, O.P.: 'The Penitential Psalms' (New translation with Notes). W. Barry: 'Free Nations and German Culture.' J. J. Walsh: 'Problems of Mental and Spiritual Healing.' R. C. Wilton: 'The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Exeter Conspiracy.' W. W. Comfort: 'A Lapsed Relationship.' O. R. Vassall-Phillips: 'A Study in the Development of Sacramental Theology' (Reviews Fr. O'Dwyer). H. Belloc: 'A Page of Gibbon' (Trial and Death of Priscillian). 'Leslie *The End of a Chapter*' ('consistently brilliant and rather hard'). 'Repplier *Counter Currents.*' [Sir] B. C. A. W[indle]: 'Morgan *The Mechanism of Mendelian Heredity*' (favourable). 'J. Spens *Shakespeare's Relation to Tradition*' ('very scholarly').

The Irish Church Quarterly (Vol. IX. No. 36. October 1916. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis). 'The Quest of an Irish Settlement.' C. P. Price: 'The War and the Churches.' H. Todd: 'The Prestige of Great Names.' T. C. Hammond: 'Authority in Religion.' D. G. Allman: 'The Authority of National Churches.' R. A. P. Rogers: 'Idealism and Realism again' (In Reply to the Bishop of Down). G. V. Jourdan: 'E. M. Hulme *The Renaissance, the Protestant Revolution and the Catholic Reformation in Continental Europe.*' N. J. D. White: 'E. A. Abbott *The Law of the New Kingdom.*' C. P. Price: 'Plummer *Devotions from Ancient and Mediaeval Sources.*' E. J. Young: 'Saeki *The Nestorian Monument in China.*' J. E. L. Oulton: 'Sparrow Simpson *Reconciliation between God and Man.*'

The Irish Theological Quarterly (Vol. XI. No. 44. October 1916. Dublin: M. H. Gill). T. J. Agius: 'Hallucinations and the Resurrection.' P. J. Gannon, S.J.: 'Comparative Religion,' I. E. J. Quigley: 'England's National Morals.' J. MacCaffrey: 'Fr. Martindale's Life of Mgr. Benson.' G. Pierse: 'Garrigou-Lagrange *Dieu, Son Existence et Sa Nature*'; 'Koch *Manual of Apologetics.*' J. MacCaffrey: 'Corcoran *State Policy in Irish Education* (1536–1816)'; 'Angot des Rotours *S. Alphonsus Liguori.*' M. J. O'Donnell: 'J. P. Kerr *Catechism of Catholic Social Principles*'; 'Elder *A Study in Socialism*'; 'Tixeront *History of Dogma*, II'; '*The Day Hours of the Church.*'

The Constructive Quarterly (Vol. IV. No. 3. September 1916. Milford). W. P. Du Bose: 'Incarnation.' W. R. Inge (Dean of St. Paul's): 'The Justice of God in History.' S. P. Cadman: 'The Organic Unity of Christ's Church.' C. H. Robinson: 'After the War, What?' F. J. McConnell: 'Aggressiveness in Christian Advance.' Most Rev. Evdokim (Russian Archbishop of N. America): 'The Mystery and Might of the Word.' H. Symonds: 'Catholicity.' W. E. Orchard: 'The Future of English Nonconformity.' J. W. Pont: 'The Lutheran Church in Holland.' H. L. Stewart: 'The Religious Consciousness as a Psychological Fact.' J. Calvet: 'French Literature during the War.' Adeline Duchess of Bedford: 'The Place of Suffering in the Spiritual

Life.' W. L. Bevan : 'George Cassander, a Reformation Champion of Reunion.'

The London Quarterly Review (No. 252. October 1916. C. H. Kelly). J. Telford : 'The Commonwealth of Nations.' E. Boutroux : 'Pascal and the Present Age.' F. W. O. Ward : 'The Christ Quest.' S. N. Singh : 'The Genesis of the Russo-Japanese Alliance.' R. A. Taylor : 'Gray and his Friends.' A. M. : 'Synagogue Sermons in the First Three Centuries.' E. C. Cooper : 'China's New President and the Political Outlook.' J. Agar Beet : 'The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible.' Notes and Discussions. '*Concerning Prayer.*' 'Ballard *Christian Reality in Modern Light.*' 'Lacey *Nature, Miracle, and Sin.*' 'G. F. Young *East and West through XV Centuries.*' 'Cadman *Three Religious Leaders of Oxford (Wyclif, Wesley, Newman).*' 'P. T. Forsyth *Christian Ethics of War.*' '*The Archbishops' Committee on Church and State.*' 'Whitehead *Village Gods of S. India*' (valuable).

The American Journal of Theology (Vol. XX. No. 4. October 1916. Chicago University Press). J. Moffatt : 'The Influence of the War upon the Religious Life and Thought of Great Britain.' A. W. Anthony : 'The New Interdenominationalism.' R. R. Marett : 'Origin and Validity in Religion.' C. Clemen : 'Buddhistic Influence in the N.T.' E. Jordan : 'The Meaning of Charity.' E. D. Burton : 'Spirit, Soul, and Flesh. V. Pneuma, Psyche, and Sarx in the N.T. and other Religious Writings approximately Contemporary with the N.T.' W. H. P. Hatch : 'McNeill *St. Matthew*' (critical). E. F. Scott : 'Legge *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity.*' G. Cross : 'Glawe *Die Hellenisierung des Christentums.*' 'R. M. Jones *Spiritual Reformers.*' H. H. Walker : 'Lagarde *The Latin Church of the Middle Ages*' (favourable). G. B. Smith : 'Sears *The Drama of the Spiritual Life*'; 'Cunningham *Christianity and Politics.*' F. A. Starratt : 'P. T. Forsyth *Theology in Church and State.*' A. C. Watson : 'D'Arcy *God and Freedom in Human Experience*' (critical). C. Burrage : 'Whitley *Works of John Smyth of Christ's* (1594–8).' 'Stokes *What Jesus Christ Thought of Himself.*' 'Box *The Virgin Birth.*' 'Mercer *The Ethiopic Liturgy.*' 'Spens *Belief and Practice.*'

The Theological Study (Vol. VIII. No. 1. October 1916. Keiseisha Shoten, 15 Owaricho Ni-chome, Kyobashi, Tokyo). I. S. Sugiura : 'The Studies of the Background of the N.T. Books.' K. Nonomura : 'The Modern Studies of Church History and History of Dogma.' O. Yamagata : 'Vernon *Confession of Faith in Jesus Christ.*' N. Nomoto : (1) 'Prof. McGiffert's Address on The Progress of Theological Thought during the Past Fifty Years'; (2) 'Prof. Faunce's Address on Religious Advance in Fifty Years.' R. Ohta : 'Jastrow *Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions.*' 'Barnes *Companion to Bible Studies.*' 'Saeki *The Nestorian Monument in China.*'

The Jewish Quarterly Review (Vol. VII. Nos. 1–2. July–October 1916. Macmillan). H. A. Wolfson : 'Crescas on the Problem of the Divine Attributes,' I (II. Oct.). H. Hirschfeld : 'Fragments of Sa'adyah's Arabic Pentateuch Commentary.' I. I. Efros : 'The Problem of Space in Jewish Mediaeval Philosophy,' II (III. Oct.). I. Lebendiger : 'The Minor in Jewish Law,' IV (V. Oct.). (The late) J. Jacobs : 'Grunwald *Samuel Oppenheimer u. sein Kreis*'; 'Joseph *Jewish Immigration into the United States.*' A. Marx : 'G. Margoliouth *Hebrew and Samaritan MSS in the British Museum,* III 8–9' (17 pp.). E. Sapir : 'Abelson *English-Yiddish Encyclopaedic Dictionary.*' October. A. A. Neuman : 'F. Baer *Studien zur Geschischte der Juden im Königreich Aragonien während des* 13. *u.* 14. *Jahrhunderts*' (7 pp.); 'Bentwich *Josephus*'; 'S. A. B. Mercer *Extra-Biblical Sources for Hebrew and Jewish History*'; 'B. H. Alford *Jewish History and Literature under the Maccabees and Herod*' (critical).

The Expositor (N.S. Nos. 70–71. October–November 1916. Hodder and Stoughton). Very Rev. M. Gaster : ' Jewish Coins and Messianic Traditions.' H. D. A. Major : ' The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil in Genesis ii and iii.' R. A. C. Macmillan : ' The Religion of Demonstration,' II (Nov. ' The Fatherhood of God and the Sonship of Jesus.') T. R. Glover : ' A Preposition of St. Paul's ' (His use of *Sun*). H. R. Mackintosh : ' " Concerning Prayer." ' Rendel Harris : ' The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel,' II (III. Nov.). November. A. Van Hoonacker : ' " And the sun stood still " (Joshua x 13).' J. Moffatt : ' Expository Notes on the Epistle to the Philippians.' H. T. Andrews : ' The Place of the Sacraments in the Teaching of St. Paul.' W. Johnstone : ' Conditional Immortality.'

The English Church Review (Vol. VII. Nos. 82–4. October–December 1916. Longmans). A. S. Duncan-Jones : ' Woman's Place in the Bible.' J. N. Figgis : ' The Office of the Priest ' (sermon). ' Younger Women and the Church of England.' ' The Ministry of Women and the Tradition of the Church.' C. Steenbuch : ' The Alleged Vicious Circle of Catholicism.' ' The Doctrine of Propitiation.' H. U. Whelpton : ' The Five Wounds of our Saviour in His Sacramental Life,' IV–V. ' Wordsworth's Religion.' ' Hankey *Faith or Fear?* ' ' Chandler *The English Church and Reunion.*' November. G. B. Roberts : ' The Report of the Archbishop's Committee on Church and State.' E. K. Sanders : ' " The Younger Women." Suggestions founded on the Recent Report.' W. J. Sparrow Simpson : ' The English Church and the Principle of Continuity. II. Its Retention of the Creed.' W. J. Brown : ' Amateurism in the Church of England.' ' The Use of Incense in the Bible.' H. E. Tudor : ' Corporate Life.' ' Days of Prayer in Country Places.' G. E. Hodgson : ' Concerning Paul Claudel.' ' Sanders *Vincent de Paul.*' ' Belton *Manual for Confessors.*' ' De Steiger *Super-humanity* ' (critical). December. O. B. G. Johnson : ' The Cross, The Heart of the World.' W. J. Sparrow Simpson : ' The Principle of Comprehensiveness.' C. F. Rogers : ' The Hours of Prayer ' (interesting). ' The Eucharistic Sacrifice ' (A Discussion of the Archbishop's Reply to Pope Leo XIII by Dr. Griffith Thomas and the Editor).

The Churchman (N.S. Vol. XXX. Nos. 130–132. October–Decembe 1916. R. Scott). W. H. Griffith Thomas : ' Validity.' J. F. Bethune-Baker : ' The Church and Social Reconstruction after the War.' M. E. W. Johnson : ' Miracle and the N.T.,' I (II. Nov.). J. K. Mozley : ' Theological Reorientation ' (Nov. Reply by T. J. Pulvertaft). C. D. Fothergill : ' The Clergy and National Irreligion.' J. R. S. Taylor : ' The Church of England and the Evangelical Spirit.' J. C. Wright : ' Emily Brontë's Poetry.' ' *Concerning Prayer* ' (' disappointing '). ' Rashdall *Conscience and Christ.*' ' Rowden *Primates of the Four Georges.*' November. Bishop of Chelmsford : ' The Call of the Mission ' (sermon). C. T. Wood : ' The Message of the War to the Clergy.' A. J. Tait : ' The Need of a New Ideal of Preaching.' W. J. Latham : ' Samuel Rutherford and his Letters.' Ven. A. E. Moule : ' The National Mission and Missions. Christ as Lord in National and International Life.' K. E. Keith : ' MacKenna *The Adventure of Death* ' (laudatory). ' J. S. Hart *Spiritual Sacrifice.*' December. H. C. Lees : ' Christ the Hope of the Nations.' W. B. : ' Impressions at Mass.' S. H. Gem : ' The Humanists and the Eve of the Reformation.' C. Grant : ' The Church and To-day.' I. G. Smith : ' The Liquor Traffic and State Control.' A. Henderson : ' Lacordaire.' ' Walpole *Witness—the Work of Disciples and Friends.*' ' J. S. Holden *The Confidence of Faith.*' ' A. Plummer *Consolation in Bereavement.*'

The Expository Times (Vol. XXVIII. Nos. 1–3. October–December 1916. T. and T. Clark). W. P. Paterson : ' Providence and the War.' D. MacGillivray : ' The Chinese *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.*' H. A. A.

Kennedy: 'The Covenant-Conception in 1 St. John.' G. Jackson: 'Izaak Walton.' T. H. Weir: 'Matt. xii.' J. Willcock: '1 Sam. xii 11; Heb. xi 32.' A. Souter: 'Pelagius' Text of Romans v 12, with Comment.' Ven. W. C. Allen: 'A Keynote of the Fourth Gospel.' J. Hastings: 'Clutton-Brock *The Ultimate Belief.*' '*Ethical and Religious Problems of the War.*' '*The Commonwealth of Nations.*' November. J. Moffatt: 'Jesus as Prisoner.' R. Winterbotham: 'Reunion with our Own in Another Life.' R. G. Macintyre: 'The Second Advent. The Fact of it.' G. Farmer: 'Ps. cx 3.' W. H. G. Thomas: 'Discipleship.' J. H. Farmer: '"Touch me not."' H. W. Fulford: '*Iesous Christos* in Acts.' R. Mackintosh: '"Henotheism" and Schelling.' W. Collins: 'Gen. iii 22.' J. Hastings: 'Hodgkin *The Missionary Spirit and the Present Opportunity*'; 'J. R. Mozley *The Divine Aspect of History*'; '*Faith or Fear?*'; 'Handcock *The Archaeology of the Holy Land.*' 'E. D. Proud *Welfare Work.*' December. J. H. Moulton: 'New Light on the Hittite Problem.' J. Donald: 'Prayer in War-time.' Ven. W. C. Allen (Archdeacon of Manchester): 'The City whose Builder and Maker is God.' A. Henderson: 'Matt. xviii 19, 20.' J. Hastings: 'C. J. Ball *Shumer and Shem*'; 'Mylne *The Holy Trinity.*' 'C. Matthews *Experiences of a Woman Doctor in Serbia.*' 'Zoe Thomson of Bishopthorpe.' 'J. E. Carpenter *Phases of Early Christianity.*' 'Maudsley *Organic to Human.*' 'R. J. Campbell *Spiritual Pilgrimage.*' 'Joire *Psychical and Supernormal Phenomena.*' 'Oldham *The World and the Gospel.*'

The Catholic World (Vol. CIV. Nos. 619–21. October–December 1916. New York: 120–122 West 60th Street). T. J. Gerrard: 'Sincerity and the Modern Drama.' A. Morgan: 'The Two John Wards. An American Treck in the Footprints of Shakespeare.' E. T. Shanahan: 'Modern Thought and the Nature of Progress.' J. J. Walsh: 'The Care of Children and the Aged' (Nov. 'The Story of Organized Care of the Insane and Defectives'). H. Grierson: 'Poverty and Riches (A Study in Origins).' Brother Potamian: 'The Coming of Age of the X-Ray.' P. Colum: 'An Irish Rebel as a Literary Critic' (Reviews 'T. MacDonagh *Literature in Ireland*'). 'Windle *A Century of Scientific Thought.*' 'Keller *Societal Evolution.*' 'J. Koren *Alcohol and Society.*' November. A. Palmieri: 'Christianity without Christ.' W. P. H. Kitchin: 'A Catholic Scholar-Statesman, Filippo Meda.' M. Bateman: 'The Catholic Note in Modern Drama.' E. Hull: 'The Poetical Works of Emily Hickey.' F. O'Hara: 'The Immigrant making a Living.' (Dec. 'The Restriction of Immigration. A Medley of Arguments'). 'S. A. Leathley *History of Marriage and Divorce*' ('quotes complacently the false statements of Bryce in his *Studies in History and Jurisprudence* and of Pollock and Maitland in their *History of English Law*'). 'Moxon *The Commonitorium of Vincent of Lerins*' (critical). December. A. T. Sadlier: 'Tercentenary of the Establishment of the Faith in Canada.' B. M. Kelly: 'A Merry Christmas' (carols etc.). E. T. Shanahan: 'Was the Son of Man Brusque to His Mother?' H. A. Doherty, jr.: 'From Christmas to Christ.' J. J. Walsh: 'Dr. J. B. Murphy.' J. T. Coffey: 'The Protestant Episcopal General Convention in St. Louis.' (Three pages of abuse.) '*Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures.*' 'Coester *Literary History of Spanish America.*' 'C. E. Chapman *The Founding of Spanish California.*' '*Concilium Tridentinum Diariorum etc. Nova Collectio*, II' (important).

The Quarterly Review (No. 449. October 1916. John Murray). C. E. Fayle: 'Industrial Reconstruction.' J. M. de Beaufort: 'A Voyage of Discovery in Germany,' II. (with Maps). W. H. Moreland: 'The Future of Indian Agriculture.' A. Waugh: 'The New Poetry.' D. Mitrany: 'German Penetration in Rumania.' A. M. Hyamson: 'Egypt and Palestine' (with Map). W. O. Horsnaill: 'British Trade and

Manufactures.' C. Singer : ' The Early Treatment of Gunshot Wounds ' (with Illustrations). C. H. Firth : ' The Study of British Foreign Policy.' W. Miller : ' The Mediaeval Serbian Empire.' A. Cecil : ' Disraeli *The Middle Phase*.' ' English and German Banking.' ' Mrs. Hughes of Uffington.' Col. W. P. Blood : ' The Course of the War ' (with Maps).

The English Historical Review (Vol. XXXI. No. 124. October 1916. Longmans). C. A. J. Skeel : ' The Canary Company.' E. R. Turner : ' Committees of the Privy Council, 1688–1760.' W. S. Robertson : ' The Juntas of 1808 and the Spanish Colonies.' J. H. Round : ' Bractoniana ' (very interesting). J. C. Davies : ' An Assembly of Wool Merchants in 1322 ' (From a previously unsorted bundle (118) of Chancery Miscellanea at the Record Office). P. S. Allen : ' Books brought from Spain in 1596.' J. L. W. Stock : ' The Diary of a Cattle Expedition among the Hottentots in 1707.' W. A. Goligher : ' Pareti *Studi Siciliani e Italioti* ' (3 pp.). J. Tait : ' H. L. Gray *English Field Systems* ' ; ' Turner and Salter *Register of St. Augustine's Canterbury*, I.' G. Unwin : ' Lipsar *Introduction to the Economic History of England*, I.' W. P. Ker : ' Brent *The Cambridge Songs*.' F. Morgan : ' Tait *Domesday Survey of Cheshire* ' (4½ pp.). F. E. Warren : ' Wickham Legg *The Sarum Missal*.' J. H. Gubbins : ' Yamada *Ghenko, The Mongol Invasion of Japan* ' ; ' Purnell *Log-Book of William Adams*, 1614–19.' T. F. Tout : ' Delachenal *Histoire de Charles V*, III.' J. P. Whitney : ' Kidd *Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation*.' C. L. Kingsford : ' Dodds *The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Exeter Conspiracy*.' W. Hunt : ' Granville *Lord Granville Leveson Gower, first Earl Granville*.' Sir A. W. Ward : ' Lord *The Second Partition of Poland*.' J. P. Gilson : ' Boland *Western Mediaeval MSS in Edinburgh University Library*.' F. E. W[arren] : ' Taylor *Celtic Christianity of Cornwall*.' H. E. E[gerton] : ' Mayo *Jeffrey Amherst* ' (critical). ' D. Thompson *Narrative of Explorations in Western America*, 1784–1812.' ' A. W. Ward *Germany* 1815–1890, I.' A. F. P[ollard] : ' *German Opinion and German Policy before the War*.' ' J. H. Rose *Nationality as a Factor in Modern History* ' (critical).

The Nineteenth Century and After (Nos. 476–8. October–December 1916. Spottiswoode, Ballantyne and Co., Ltd.). Maj.-Gen. S. S. Long : ' Right and Wrong Methods of Demobilisation.' J. E. Barker : ' Britain's Coming Industrial Supremacy.' F. Passelecq : ' Belgian Unity and the Flemish Movement.' G. Saunders : ' *Faust* and the German Character.' Sir H. Blake : ' Is there a Way out of the Chaos in Ireland ? Some Reflections by a Southern Unionist.' Sir M. McIlwraith : ' The Mohammedan Law Courts of Egypt. A Recent Chapter in Egyptian History.' F. (Lady) Kinloch-Cooke : ' A Visit to Paris on the Eve of the Revolution.' J. Leyland : ' The U.S. Navy in the Making.' Sir F. Piggott : ' Belligerent and Neutral from 1756–1915,' II (III. Nov.). L. G. Brock : ' The Re-education of the Disabled.' A. Riley : ' " Male and Female created He them." A Reply to Miss Picton-Turbervill.' (Nov. Reply by her — ' The Coming Order in the Church of Christ,' II.). E. Tavernier : ' A Great Russian Philosopher ' (Soloviev). L. S. Benjamin : ' A Study of German Propaganda.' C. Battine : ' The Ministry of War and the Military Executive.' Brig.-General F. G. Stone : ' Eighteen Months with the New Armies.' November. H. W. Fox : ' A Platform for an Imperial Party.' Brig.-General F. G. Stone : ' King Constantine of Greece and Frederick William III of Prussia. A Parallel ? ' Right Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter : ' Dante's Appeal to Nations and Peoples.' D. C. Lathbury : ' The Latest Irish Problem.' Capt. G. S. C. Swinton : ' Castles in the Air at Charing Cross.' Capt. P. Millet : ' Twelve Months with the British Army.' Bishop of Carlisle : ' The New Education.' S. P. B. Mais : ' Some Poets of To-day.' H. M. Hyndman : ' The Railway Problem solved.' A. M. W. Stirling : ' Fighting in Flanders in 1793–4 : from the Diary of Charles Hotham, Coldstream Guards,' II. W. G. Fitz-

gerald : ' Wilson or Hughes ? " Preparedness " as the great Election Issue.' M. Frewen : ' The Economics of J. J. Hill.' J. A. R. Marriott : ' *Mitteleuropa* and the Meaning of the Paris Pact.' December. Lord Sydenham : ' The Danger in India.' Sir C. Waldstein : ' The Social Gulf between England and Germany.' E. Bevan : ' Common Sense about Peace.' J. E. Barker : ' The German Emperor's Position.' Lord Hindlip : ' Agriculture. Wanted a Policy.' S. K. Ratcliffe : ' The Re-election of President Wilson.' Sir P. Magnus, M.P. : ' Emerson's Thoughts on Education as bearing on Modern Problems.' C. E. Maud : ' The Mother of the Navy ' (Miss Weston). H. J. G. Merrin, R.N. : ' The First German Shells on England. A Sailor's Account of the Lowestoft Raid.' R. Machray : ' Confident Russia.' H. M. Paull : ' The Personal Element in Fiction.' M. A. R. Tuker : ' Women Preachers.' Sir M. Morris : ' The Stumbling Block of Compulsory Notification.' A. A. Baumann : ' About Personal Economy.' H. W. Harris : ' The Case for Municipal Milk.' Capt. R. W. Hallows, R.A. : ' Artillery Methods in Modern War.' G. N. Bankes : ' A Way to National Regeneration.'

The Hindustan Review (Vol. XXXIV. No. 204. August 1916. Allahabad : 7 Elgin Road). J. C. Banerjee : ' Rationalism in India,' II. S. C. Mitra : ' Home and Communal Life in Buddhist India.' V. K. Bhuta : ' India in the Fight for Freedom.' L. Sud : ' Belgium and the Great War.' N. K. Venkatesan : ' The Social and Religious Foundations of Indian Nationality ' I. H. W. B. Moreno : ' The Armenians in India. Some Facts and Figures.' M. Lal : ' Prof. Gilbert Murray on War and India.' G. G. Lambheker : ' The Hindu University of Benares. A Few Thoughts and Suggestions.' M. L. Zutshi : ' Sarkar *History of Aurangzeb*.' K. L. Oza : ' A. C. Headlam *Miracles of the N.T.*' (' There is an undercurrent of apostolic zeal which sometimes savours of special pleading and mars the beauty of an otherwise well-reasoned treatise.') A. Dutt : ' The Root Cause of the Great War.' ' The Literature of Treitschke and his Works.'

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift (Vol. VI. No. 4. October–December 1916. Bern : Stämpfli). E. Herzog : ' Bischof Dr. John Wordsworth.' B. W. Wells : ' The Garden City Conference. Notes and Impressions.' J. Friedrich : ' Meine Briefe an Döllinger aus dem Konzilsjahre 1869–70 ' (*concluded*). E. Moog : ' Eine neue Untersuchung zur Geschichte des " Jansenismus ".' E. Michaud : ' Urbain et Levesque *Bossuet Correspondance* X.' ' Dehio *Innocenz IV u. England*.' E. H[erzog] : ' Veress *Acta et Epistolae Relationum Transylvaniae Hungariaeque cum Moldavia et Valachia*, I (1468–1540).'

Theologisch Tijdschrift (N.S. Vol. VIII. No. 6. 1916. Leiden : S. C. van Doesburgh). L. N. de Jong : ' Schets eener Vrijzinnig-christelijke Geloofsleer.' H. J. Toxopeus : ' Maurice Jones contra Kirsopp Lake.' G. Smid : ' Het Sjemone-Esre-gebed.'

Teologisk Tidsskrift (Vol. VII. No. 3. 1916. Copenhagen : G. E. C. Gad). N. M. Plum : ' Lidelses historiens Harmonisering.' E. Rohde : ' Svenska kyrkan 1915.' J. Pedersen : ' Duhm *Das Buch Jesaia* ' ; ' F. Buhl *Jesaja* ' ; ' Jensen *Jesaja*.' F. Torm : ' Zahn *Kommentar zum N.T.*' H. Mosbech : ' Bugge *Das Christus-Mysterium*.' F. Torm : ' Strathmann *Geschichte der frühchristlichen Askese* ' ; ' Grosch *Der im Gal.* 2, 11–14 *berichtete Vorgang in Antiochien*.' C. Glarbo : ' Ording *Den Kristelige Tro*.'

The International Review of Missions (Vol. V. Nos. 19–20. July–October 1916. Milford). W. J. W. Roome : ' Strategic Lines of Christian Missions in Africa.' A. H. Smith : ' A Chapter of Experience in China.' A. H. Small : ' Missionary Life as Vocation.' C. H. Robinson : ' The Conversion of Russia.' L. Dahle : ' The Home Base of Missions in Norway.' R. E. Diffendorfer : ' Missionary Education in the Sunday School.' H. Bois : 'A Sociological View of Religion.' J. N. Farquhar :

'Christian Literature in India.' 'Christian Literature for the Jews. Notes on an Inter-Society Conference.' E. Stock: 'The *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* on Missions.' A. E. Garvie: 'Jordan *Comparative Religion, its Adjuncts and Allies.*' A. J. Gossip: 'K. J. Saunders *The Heart of Buddhism.*' H. A. Junod: 'Roscoe *The Northern Bantu.*' J. H. Weeks: 'Cureau *Savage Man in Central Africa.*' A. Werner: 'Claridge *History of the Gold Coast and Ashanti.*' E. G. Kemp: 'Meakin *In Russian Turkestan.*' E. F. Bell: 'E. W. Clement *Short History of Japan*'; 'Griffis *The Mikado.*' J. T. Dean: 'Werner *The Language Families of Africa.*' October. H. R. Mackintosh: 'The Secret of Vitality in the Pauline Churches.' T. H. P. Sailer: 'Some Impressions of Education in the Far East.' Bishop of Madras: 'The Reform of Missionary Education in India.' W. Miller: 'The Educational Work of Indian Missions.' E. Stock: 'The Christianizing of the Maoris. A Contribution to the Study of Missions and Civilization.' J. W. Inglis: 'The Christian Element in Chinese Buddhism.' M. Stevenson: 'Love of Beauty as a Factor in Missionary Life.' F. L. Brown: 'The Sunday School Situation in China, Korea and Japan.' F. Münck: 'Danish Missions.' J. Mustakallio: 'The Finnish Missionary Society.' S. J. W. Clark: 'Some Notes on World Mission Survey.' A. Vissière: 'Saeki *The Nestorian Monument in China.*' R. Rouse: 'Schlatter *Geschichte der Basler Mission* 1815–1915, I.' H. Haigh: 'Plaatje *Native Life in S. Africa.*' W. D. Mackenzie: 'Oldham *The World and the Gospel.*' J. N. Farquhar: 'Maitra *Hinduism, the World Ideal.*' H. U. Weitbrecht: 'S. G. Wilson *Bahaism and its Claims.*' A. C. Fletcher: 'Collison *In the Wake of the War Canoe*'; 'Spence *The Myths of the N. American Indians.*' A. L. Williams: 'Prideaux *The Cradle of Christianity*'; S. C. Kirkpatrick *Through the Jews to God*'; 'Schechter *Seminary Addresses*'; 'Box *The Virgin Birth.*' J. H. Oldham: 'Planchet *Les Missions de Chine et du Japon.*' G. A. Gollock: 'Schwager *The Most Vital Mission Problem of the Day.*' 'C. C. J. Webb *Group Theories of Religion and the Individual.*'

The Church Missionary Review (Vol. LXVII. Nos. 809–11. October–December 1916. C.M.S.). E. F. E. Wigram: 'The New Atmosphere.' S. H. Clark: 'Oldham *The World and the Gospel.*' W. S. Hunt: 'The Travancore Centenary Celebrations.' J. H. Linton: 'A Call from the Kashgais. Is it the Call of God?' November. 'The Glory of the Impossible.' E. S. Woods: 'The Real "Holy War."' G. S. Eddy: 'The C.M.S. Contribution to the Evangelization of Asia.' H. U. Weitbrecht: 'Christian Literature in India.' W. P. Harcs: 'The Narowal Mission. A Ten Years' Retrospect.' 'Bishop of Nagpur *Story of Gondwana.*' 'K. J. Saunders *Story of Buddhism.*' December. E. F. E. Wigram: 'The Old Message.' C. D. Snell: 'Christianity in its Relation to Trade.' H. Girling: '"In Search of the other Sheep." A Journey of the "Blonde Eskimo."' R. Maconachie: 'Indian Notes.' H. W. Moule: 'The Chinese Version of the Life of Christ' (A.D. 1700).

The East and the West (Vol. XIV. No. 56. October 1916. S.P.G.). Bishop of Southampton: 'The National Mission of Repentance and Hope in Relation to the Work of Foreign Missions.' R. E. Freeth: 'Christian Influences on a Dying Race' (Melanesians). Right Rev. H. H. Montgomery: 'The Organization of the Church.' R. E. Speer: 'The Panama Congress on Christian Work in Latin America.' J. A. Armitage: 'Medical Missions in China.' H. Kelly: 'The Pattern of the Early Church. The Formation of the Ministry.' J. S. B. Brough: 'God and the War.' J. T. Parfit: 'Mesopotamia, its Interest for Christendom.' J. H. Weeks: 'Mission Work in W. Africa. A Reply to Mr. Dennett.' 'Stock *History of C.M.S.*, IV.' 'Jaini *Outlines of Jainism*' (critical). 'Oldham *The World and the Gospel.*' 'Bishop of Madras *The Village Gods of S. India.*' 'Taylor *Celtic Christianity in Cornwall*' (critical). 'Bishop of Nagpur *The Story of Gondwana.*'

Books Received.

The more important will be noticed in Articles and Short Notices as space permits.

Biblical and Kindred Studies.

Crafer, T. W.—*The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah.* 'The Revised Version edited for the use of Schools.' Pp. xxx + 138. (Cambridge University Press.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net with map.

Devine, M.—*Ecclesiastes or the Confessions of an Adventurous Soul: A Practical Application of the Book of Koheleth called 'Ecclesiastes.'* Pp. viii + 238. (Macmillan.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Handcock, P. S. P.—*The Archaeology of the Holy Land.* Pp. 384. (Fisher Unwin.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net. With coloured Frontispiece, 25 Plates, 109 Figures in Text, and 2 Folding Plans.

Oesterley, W. O. E.—*The Wisdom of Ben-Sira (Ecclesiasticus).* 'Translations of Early Documents. Series I: Palestinian Jewish Texts (Pre-Rabbinic).' Pp. 148. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Parry, R. St. J.—*The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians.* With Introduction and Notes. 'Cambridge Greek Testament.' Pp. lxxviii + 284. (Cambridge University Press.) 4*s.* 6*d* net.

Torrey, C. C.—*The Composition and Date of Acts.* 'Harvard Theological Studies,' I. Pp. 72. (Harvard University Press. Oxford University Press.) By the Professor of the Semitic Languages in Yale University.

Wiener, H. M.—*The Date of the Exodus.* Pp. 454–480. (Oberlin, Ohio: Bibliotheca sacra Co.) Reprinted from *Bibliotheca sacra.*

Williams, A. L.—*The Hebrew-Christian Messiah or The Presentation of the Messiah to the Jews in the Gospel according to St. Matthew.* Being Twelve Lectures delivered before the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn on the Foundation of Bishop Warburton in the years 1911–1915. With Introductory Note by the Bishop of Ely. Pp. xxii + 426. (S.P.C.K.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Metaphysics and Philosophy of Religion.

Bevan, J. O.—*Handbook of the History and Development of Philosophy.* Pp. viii + 224. (Chapman and Hall.) 5*s.* net.

Collingwood, R. G.—*Religion and Philosophy.* Pp. xviii + 220. (Macmillan.) 5*s.* net.

De Tonquédec, J.—*Introduction à l'Étude du Merveilleux et du Miracle.* Pp. xvi + 462. (Paris: Beauchesne.) 5 *francs.*

Fuller, Sir B.—*Man as He is: Essays in a New Psychology.* Pp. 248. (Murray.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Jones, R. M.—*The Inner Life.* Pp. xii + 194. (Macmillan Co.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net. By the Professor of Philosophy in Haverford College.

Marshall, B.—*Studies in Life and Nature.* Pp. vi + 122. (Elliot Stock.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Merrington, E. N.—*The Problem of Personality: a Critical and Constructive Study in the Light of Recent Thought.* Pp. x + 230. (Macmillan.) 5*s.*

Temple, W.—*Mens Creatrix. An Essay.* Pp. xiv + 368. (Macmillan.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Apologetics.

Rogers, C. F.—*The Christian's Claim about Jesus of Nazareth: 'Perfect God and Perfect Man.'* Pp. 58. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.* net.

Sturge, M. C.—*Christianity and Christian Science.* Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.)

Thorburn, T. J.—*The Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels: Critical Studies in the Historic Narratives.* 'Bross Prize,' 1915. Pp. xxiv + 356. (New York: Scribner. [Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.]) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Christian Doctrine of Health: A Handbook on the Relations of Bodily to Spiritual and Moral Health. By the Author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia.* Pp. x + 198. (Macmillan.) 2*s.* net.

The Elements of Pain and Conflict in Human Life, considered from a Christian Point of View. Being Lectures delivered at the Cambridge Summer Meeting, 1916, by Members of the University. Pp. vi + 206. (Cambridge University Press.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net. By Professors W. R. Sorley and V. H. Stanton, Dr. F. R. Tennant, Dr. J. W. Oman and the Dean of Worcester.

Doctrinal Theology.

Chase, F. H. (Bishop of Ely).—*The Ascension of Jesus Christ: 'He ascended into Heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. VII. Pp. 20. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

D'Arcy, C. F. (Bishop of Down).—*God: 'In God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. II. Pp. 20. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

Figgis, J. N. (C.R.).—*The Church: 'The Holy Catholick Church.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. XI. Pp. 20. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

Gore, C. (Bishop of Oxford).—*The Religion of the Church: A Manual of Membership.* Pp. viii + 196. (Mowbray.) 1*s.* net. See Article.

Goudge, H. L.—*The Holy Trinity: 'I believe in the Holy Ghost.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. X. Pp. 20. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net. By the Principal of Ely Theological College.

Hardy, T. J.—*Catholic or Roman Catholic? Twelve Letters to one unsettled in the English Church.* 'Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice. Pp. 158. (R. Scott.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Holland, H. S.—*The Real Problem of Eschatology.* The Liverpool Lecture 1916, delivered in St. Nicholas's Church, Liverpool, on June 19, 1916. 'Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications,' No. XIV. Pp. 36. (Longmans.) 6*d.* net.

Holland, H. S.—*The Resurrection of Jesus Christ: 'The third day he rose again from the dead.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. VI. Pp. 12. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

Malden, R. H.—*The Life after Death: 'The Resurrection of the body, And the life everlasting.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. XIV. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net. By the Principal of Leeds Clergy School.

Mozley, J. K.—*Jesus Christ and Sin: 'Was crucified, dead, and buried, He descended into hell.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. V. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

Nairne, A.—*The Meaning of the Incarnation: 'And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. III. Pp. 22. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

Parsons, R. G.—*The Holy Spirit: 'I believe in the Holy Ghost.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. IX. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

RAVEN, C. E.—*What think ye of Christ? Being Lectures on the Incarnation and its Interpretation in Terms of Modern Thought.* Pp. xxx + 250. (Macmillan.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net. By the Dean of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

RAWLINSON, A. E. J.—*The Communion of Saints: 'The Communion of Saints.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. XII. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

STANTON, V. H.—*Jesus Christ and History: 'Born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. IV. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

STRONG, T. B. (Dean of Christ Church).—*Faith: 'I believe.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. I. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

SWETE, H. B.—*Jesus Christ as Judge: 'From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. VIII. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

SWETE, H. B.—*The Forgiveness of Sins. A Study in the Apostles' Creed.* Pp. xiv + 198. (Macmillan.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

THORNTON, L. S. (C.R.)—*Forgiveness: 'The Forgiveness of Sins.'* 'New Tracts on the Creed,' No. XIII. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K. for the National Mission.) 2*d.* net.

WINSTANLEY, E. W.—*The Divine in Human Life: Lectures on the Doctrine of the Incarnation.* Pp. 96. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Practical and Devotional Theology.

ARCHIBALD, M. G.—*A Call to Prayer.* Pp. 62. (R. Scott.) 6*d.* net.

BENSON, R. M. (the late).—*The Divine Rule of Prayer, or Considerations upon the Lord's Prayer, with Various Forms of Analysis and Paraphrase.* With Preface by G. CONGREVE, S.S.J.E. Pp. xii + 128. (Mowbray.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

BOYD, F.—*Plain Hints for Retreatants.* 'Retreat Manuals,' No. 2. Pp. 16. (London: Association for Short Retreats, 8 Carlisle Mansions, Westminster.) 1*d.*

BULL, P. (C.R.)—*The Threefold Way: An Aid to Conversion.* Pp. viii +182. (Longmans.) 2*s.* net.

BURTON, S.—*The Renewing of Catholicism: Evangelical Essays towards Religious Renewal and Unification.* With Foreword by W. B. SELBIE. Pp. 130. (R. Scott.) 2*s.* net. See Article.

CARLETON, G. D.—*Coram Deo. Exercises in Mental Prayer for Beginners.* With Foreword by D. JENKS. Pp. xx + 118. (Mowbray.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

CROFTS, H. E.—*Our Threefold Duty. Plain Words about the Duty of Church Members in Regard to Church Attendance, Almsgiving, Personal Service.* Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.) 3*s.* per 100.

CUNLIFFE, LADY.—*A Book for Little Soldiers. Readings for a Month intended for Young Children.* Preface by the ARCHDEACON OF ROCHDALE. Pp. 94. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

FORDE, G. M.—*Heroes and Writers of the Book of Common Prayer.* Pp. 212. (S.P.C.K.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net. With eight illustrations.

FREE, R.—*Forbidden Ways or Friendly Warnings to Church Folk.* Pp. viii + 108. (Sampson Low, Marston and Co. Ltd.) 2*s.* net.

GOODMAN, H.—*Jesus of Nazareth and the Christian Churches of To-day.* Pp. 46. (Cambridge: Heffer.) 6*d.* net.

HOLLIS, G.—*Every Child's Book about the Church.* Pp. xii + 158. (Mowbray.) 2*s.* net. With 16 illustrations.

HOLLIS, G.—*Praises with Understanding: a Book about the Psalms.* Pp. 96. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hollis, G.—*The Wonderful Prayer : the Lord's Prayer and its Teaching simply explained.* Pp. 78. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s.* net.

Hughson, S. C. (O.H.C.)—*Protestant Liberty and Catholic Loyalty : some considerations on 'Liberty and Loyalty,' a Recent Charge of the Bishop of Vermont.* Pp. 30. (New York, West Park : Holy Cross.) 25 *cents.*

Lancelot, J. B.—*Faith and Creed.* 'Lessons in Essentials' (Second Series). Pp. xii + 82. (Liverpool : E. Howell.) 1*s.* By the Principal of Liverpool College.

Louismet, S. (O.S.B.)—*The Mystical Knowledge of God : An Essay in the Art of Knowing and Loving the Divine Majesty.* Pp. xvi + 84. (Burns and Oates.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

McClure, M. L.—*Thoughts on the Sacraments.* (Sequel to *The Church Catechism explained to Children.*) Pp. 160. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

McNeile, A. H.—*'After this Manner Pray ye.' Studies in the Lord's Prayer.* Pp. x + 90. (Cambridge : Heffer.) 1*s.* 3*d.* net.

Masterman, J. H. B.—*Sunday Collects : Studies for the Christian Year.* Pp. 160. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s.* net.

Moule, H. C. G. (Bishop of Durham).—*A Letter of Comfort to a Sorrow-stricken Friend.* Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 2*d.* net.

Pridie, J. R.—*The National Mission of Repentance and Hope in its Appeal to the Corporate Life of the Church.* Pp. 20. (Elliot Stock.) 4*d.* net. By the Vicar of Ham, Surrey.

Seyzinger, E. E. (C.R.)—*The Hymn 'Veni Creator Spiritus' paraphrased for Praise and Prayer and other Devotions to the Holy Spirit.* Pp. viii + 56. (Mowbray.) 4*d.* net. First Edition 1914.

Woods, E. S.—*Knights in Armour.* Foreword by General Sir William Robertson, K.C.B., Chief of the Imperial General Staff. Pp. vi + 58. (Robert Scott.) 1*s.* net. By the chaplain of the R.M.C. Sandhurst.

Religious Reconstruction after the War. A Cambridge Programme. 'St. Edward's Cambridge Series,' II. Pp. 154. (R. Scott.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Manual. A Nation-Wide Preaching Mission. Issued by the Commission on a Nation-Wide Preaching Mission. Pp. viii + 140. (Milwaukee : Young Churchman Co.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Sermons and Homiletics.

Cunningham, W.—*British Citizens and their Responsibility to God.* Six sermons in Preparation for the National Mission, 1916, preached in Great St. Mary's, Cambridge. Pp. 46. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

Ellis, J.—*Keep to the Right : A Collection of Ten-Minute Talks to Children.* Sixty-five Addresses to Children and a Large Number of Suggestive Illustrations and Incidents. Compiled. Pp. 172. (R. Scott.) 2*s.* net.

Figgis, J. N. (C.R.)—*Some Defects in English Religion and other Sermons.* 'Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice.' Pp. 140. (R. Scott.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Gwynne, W.—*Seven Hundred Stories and Illustrations of Christian Doctrine.* For the use of Teachers and Preachers. Pp. vi + 414. (S.P.C.K.) 5*s.* net.

Key, S. W.—*The Material in Support of the Spiritual : One Hundred and Three Similes or Illustrations for use in the Preparation of Sermons and Addresses.* With a few contributions by the Compiler. Pp. 94. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net. By the Vicar of All Saints, Ipswich.

Wilson, J. M.—*God's Progressive Revelations of Himself to Men.* Seven Sermons preached in Worcester Cathedral, in Lent, 1916. Pp. 64. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.* net.

Self-Surrender and Self-Will : Being Addresses on the Religious Life

given to a Community of Sisters. By the Author of *The Splendour of God.* With Preface by B. W. RANDOLPH. To which is now added *The Life of the Counsels.* Pp. xii + 170. (Mowbray.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net. First edition published in 1913.

Teachings of Christ and the Apostles: Outlines for Meditations or Sermons on the Daily New Testament Lessons. Part I. *The Teachings of Christ.* By A PRIEST. With Introduction by the Right Rev. W. HORNBY, D.D., BISHOP OF NASSAU. Pp. xvi + 342. (Longmans.) 6*s.* net.

The Vocation of Empire. A course of Sermons preached in the Church of St. Michael, Cornhill, in Lent, 1916. Pp. 80. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.* By the Rev. J. O. F. MURRAY, D.D., W. TEMPLE, E. A. BURROUGHS, J. ELLISON, C. C. HARPER, and BISHOP COPLESTON.

PATRISTIC TEXTS.

CLARKE, W. K. L.—*St. Gregory of Nyssa, 'The Life of St. Macrina.'* 'Early Church Classics.' Pp. 80. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.* net.

HITCHCOCK, F. R. M.—*The Treatise of Irenaeus of Lugdunum against the Heresies.* A Translation of the Principal Passages, with Notes and Arguments. 'Early Church Classics.' Two Volumes. Pp. 146, 152. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s.* each net.

LITURGIOLOGY.

SPARROW SIMPSON, W. J.—*The Prayer of Consecration.* Introduction by the BISHOP OF OXFORD. 'Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice.' Pp. iv + 164. (R. Scott.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Some Vindications of the Book of Common Prayer appearing in Unexpected Quarters. Gathered by Dr. J. WICKHAM LEGG. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 3*d.* net. Reprinted from the *Church Times.*

Twelve Services of Family Prayer for Morning or Evening Use liturgically arranged. By A LAYMAN. Pp. 58. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.* and 1*s.* net.

MISSIONS.

MACONACHIE, R.—*Rowland Bateman, Nineteenth Century Apostle.* Pp. xii + 208. (C.M.S.) 3*s.* net.

Missions Overseas. Ninth Annual Review, 1916. Pp. viii + 170. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net. A copy of this invaluable survey issued by the Central Board of Missions ought to be in the hands of everyone who cares for Missions and should be found also a most useful means to stimulating interest.

HISTORY.

CARPENTER, J. E.—*Phases of Early Christianity.* Six Lectures. 'American Lectures on the History of Religions.' Pp. viii + 450. (Putnam.) 2 *dollars* net.

DAVENPORT, E. H.—*The False Decretals.* Pp. xxiv + 112. (Oxford: B. H. Blackwell.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

HUGHES, W.—*A History of the Church of the Cymry from the Earliest Period to the Present Time.* A New Edition—revised. Pp. xvi + 412. (Elliot Stock.) 10*s.* net. By the Vicar of Llanuwchllyn.

JEUDWINE, J. W.—*The Manufacture of Historical Material: an Elementary Study in the Sources of Story.* Pp. xxviii + 268. (Williams and Norgate.) 6*s.* net.

MCCONNELL, S. D.—*History of the American Episcopal Church.* Tenth Edition. Revised and enlarged and continued to the Year 1915. Pp. xx + 468. (Milwaukee: Young Churchman Co. London: Mowbray.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

PEARCE, E. H. (Archdeacon of Westminster).—*The Monks of Westminster. Being a Register of the Brethren of the Convent from the Time of the Confessor to the Dissolution.* With Lists of the Obedientiaries and an Introduction. Pp. x + 236. (Cambridge University Press.) 10*s.* net.

Diocesis Cantuariensis. Registrum Matthaei Parker, Pars Quinta. 'Canterbury and York Society Publications,' Part LII. December 1916. Pp. 449–544. (London: 124 Chancery Lane.) Subscription *one guinea* per annum.

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY.

BUELOW, PRINCE VON.—*Imperial Germany.* With a Foreword by J. W. HEADLAM. Translated by M. A. LEWENZ. New and Revised Edition. Pp. xlvi + 336. (Cassell and Co.) 6*s.* net.

WILLIAMSON, J. A.—*The Foundation and Growth of the British Empire.* Pp. xii + 290. (Macmillan.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Empire and the Future: A Series of Imperial Studies. Lectures delivered in the University of London, King's College. Pp. xvi + 110. (Macmillan.) 2*s.* net.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANTIQUITIES.

FAIRBAIRNS, W. H.—*Sheffield. 'Notes on the Cathedrals.'* Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1*d.*

NOLLOTH, C. F.—*Beverley Minster. 'Notes on Famous Churches and Abbeys.'* Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1*d.*

ROBINSON, J. L.—*The Cathedral Church of the Holy Trinity, commonly called Christ Church, Dublin.* 'Notes on Famous Churches and Abbeys.' Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1*d.*

ROBINSON, J. L.—*The Cathedral Church of St. Patrick, Dublin.* 'Notes on Famous Churches and Abbeys.' Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1*d.*

SMITH, E. F.—*Tewkesbury Abbey.* 'Notes on Famous Churches and Abbeys.' Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1*d.*

TRAVEL.

FIRTH, J. B.—*Highways and Byways in Nottinghamshire.* With Illustrations by F. L. GRIGGS. Pp. xx + 426. (Macmillan.) 6*s.* net.

SHKLOVSKY, I. W. ('DIONEO').—*In Far North-East Siberia.* Translated by L. EDWARDS and Z. SHKLOVSKY. Pp. viii + 264. (Macmillan.) 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

EDUCATION.

LIVINGSTONE, R. W.—*A Defence of Classical Education.* Pp. xii + 278. (Macmillan.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

WALTERS, C. F. and CONWAY, R. S.—*Deigma. A First Greek Book.* With the co-operation of C. I. DANIEL. Pp. xxiv + 408. (Murray.) 3*s.* 6*d.* With 4 illustrations, a plan and a map.

WAR LITERATURE.

BURY, Right Rev. H.—*Here and there in the War Area.* Pp. xii + 328. (Mowbrays.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net. With 32 Illustrations.

FORMBY, C. W. *The Soul of England, or A Great Empire at the Cross Roads.* Pp. viii + 168. (Wells Gardner.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

KIPLING, R.—*Sea Warfare.* Pp. vi + 222. (Macmillan.) 5*s.* net.

MOLESWORTH, J. H.—*A Soldier of God: The Ideals of War. A Memory of Lord Kitchener.* Pp. 48. (Elliot Stock.) An Essay and two Sermons by the former Chaplain of All Saints, Cairo.

PRÉVOST, M.—*Benoît Castain.* Translated by A. C. RICHMOND. Pp. iv + 224. (Macmillan.) 2*s.* net.

STEPHENS, W.—*The Soul of Russia.* Pp. xviii + 308. (Macmillan.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net. In aid of the Fund for Russian Refugees administered by the General Committee of the All Russian Union of Zemstvos under the Presidency of Prince G. E. Lvov.

SWETENHAM, L.—*War : the Cross of the Nations.* Introduction by the BISHOP OF EDINBURGH. Pp. 88. (R. Scott.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

WICKES, F. R. H.—*The Making of the Flag : a Patriotic Mask.* Pp. 32. (Elliot Stock.) 1*s.* net.

BIOGRAPHY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

BLOSS, W. E.—*'Twixt the Old and the New : A Study in the Life and Times of John Henry Cardinal Newman.* Pp. xx + 268. (S.P.C.K.) **5***s.* **net.**

CAMPBELL, R. J.—*A Spiritual Pilgrimage.* Pp. x + 340. (Williams and Norgate.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net. See Article.

FENOLLOSA, E. and POUND, E.—*'Noh' or Accomplishment : A Study of the Classical Stage of Japan.* Pp. viii + 268. (Macmillan.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

FREEMAN, J.—*The Moderns : Essays in Literary Criticism.* Pp. vi + 342. (R. Scott.) 6*s.* net.

RICKARDS, E. C.—*Zoe Thomson of Bishopthorpe and her Friends.* With Preface by BASIL THOMSON. Pp. xx + 196. (Murray.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net. With Portraits and Illustrations.

SHUTTLEWORTH, C. B.—*A Record of the Unveiling in Worcester Cathedral of the Memorial Tablet to Mrs. Henry Wood, the Famous Victorian Novelist.* Pp. 24. (Macmillan.) 1*s.* net.

YEATS, W. B.—*Reveries over Childhood and Youth.* Pp. x + 214. (Macmillan). 6*s.* net.

Letters of the Rev. H. H. Jeaffreson. Edited by C. E. LAMBERT. Foreword by the BISHOP OF WINCHESTER. With Portrait and Short Memoir. Pp. xxiv + 278. (Longmans.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Robert Linklater, Man, Missioner, and Priest : A Biographical Sketch of an Ideal Catholic. With Foreword by the BISHOP OF LONDON and the ARCHDEACON OF WINCHESTER. Pp. xii + 154. (Wells Gardner.) **3***s.* **6***d.* **net.**

POETRY.

GIBSON, W. W.—*Livelihood. Dramatic Reveries.* Pp. xii + 136. (Macmillan.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

HARDY, THOMAS.—*Selected Poems.* 'Golden Treasury Series.' Pp. x + 214. (Macmillan.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

KIMBALL, H. McE.—*Poems.* Third Edition Enlarged. Pp. x + 220. (Milwaukee : Young Churchman Co. London : Mowbray.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

LOW, M.—*Victory or Death and Other Poems.* Pp. 22. (R. Scott.) 1*s.* net.

YEATS, W. B.—*Responsibilities and other Poems.* Pp. xii + 188. Macmillan.) 6*s.* n et.

NOVELS AND GIFT BOOKS.

BLACKWOOD, A.—*The Wave : an Egyptian Aftermath.* Pp. vi + 436. (Macmillan.) 5*s.* net.

FORTESCUE, Hon. J. W.—*The Three Pearls.* With Illustrations by A. B. WOODWARD. Pp. viii + 248. (Macmillan.) 6*s.* net.

GREENE, H. PLUNKET.—*Pilot and other Stories.* Pp. viii + 230. (Macmillan.) 6*s.* net. For children about animals. Illustrated by H. Ford.

HEWLETT, M.—*Love and Lucy*. Pp. viii + 344. (Macmillan.) 5*s*. net.

MOLESWORTH, Mrs.—*Edmée : A Tale of the French Revolution*. Illustrated by G. D. HAMMOND. Pp. viii + 256. (Macmillan.) 3*s*. 6*d*.

NEALE, J. M. (the late).—*The Exiles of the Cebenna : A Journal written during the Decian Persecution, by Aurelius Gratianus, Priest of the Church of Arles, and now done into English*. Pp. 128. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s*. 3*d*.

NEALE, J. M. (the late).—*The Lily of Tiflis. A Sketch from Georgian Church History*. Pp. 94. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s*. 3*d*.

NEALE, J. M. (the late).—*The Sword of King Affonso : A Tale of the Portuguese Church in the Sixteenth Century* [*Larache*]. Pp. 94. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s*. 3*d*.

OAKLEY, G. R.—*The Cross and the Sword : Stories of the Royal Soldier-Saints of England*. Pp. 124. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s*. net. By the Vicar of St. Andrew's, Dearnley.

O'REILLY, J. A.—*The Last Sentinel of Castle Hill. A Newfoundland Story*. Pp. 382. (Elliot Stock.) 6*s*. net.

ORPEN, T. H.—*The Rain-children. A Fairy Tale in Physics*. With seven Illustrations by C. E. BROCK, R.I. Pp. viii + 112. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s*. 6*d*. A charming children's book written for the benefit of the Belgian and Serbian Relief Funds by a former Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

TAGORE, Sir R.—*Hungry Stones and other Stories*. Translated from the original Bengali by various writers. Pp. viii + 272. (Macmillan.) 5*s*. net.

WILSON, R.—*The Russian Story Book, containing Tales from the Song-cycles of Kiev and Novgorod and other early sources retold*. Pp. 308. (Macmillan.) 7*s*. 6*d*. net. With 16 Coloured Plates and Line Illustrations from drawings by F. C. Papé.

MISCELLANEOUS.

GORE, C. (Bishop of Oxford).—*Self-Government for the Church*. 'Church Self-Government Papers,' No. 2. Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.) 3*s*. per 100 net.

LEE, J.—*The Church and Women*. An Address delivered at the Church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. Pp. 32. (Longmans.) 6*d*. net.

MASTERMAN [J. H. B.]—*Establishment and Freedom : A Lesson from Scotland*. 'Church Self-Government Papers,' No. 1. (S.P.C.K.) 3*s*. per 100 net.

ROYDEN, A. M.—*Women and the Church of England*. Pp. 14. (Allen and Unwin.) 3*d*. net.

A Call to Baptismal Reform : a Bible and Prayer-Book Study. By 'ARCHIPPUS.' Pp. 126. (Allen and Unwin.) 3*s*. 6*d*. net.

The Living Church Annual and Churchman's Almanac : A Church Encyclopaedia and Almanac, 1917. Pp. 494. (Milwaukee : Young Churchman Co.) 50 *cents*.

Mowbray's Annual. The Churchman's Year Book and Encyclopaedia, A.D. 1917. Pp. 384. (Mowbrays.) 1*s*. 6*d*. net. Of steadily increasing usefulness and completeness.

Oxford University Press General Catalogue, November 1916. Pp. viii + 568. (Oxford University Press.) Quite unlike any other volume of its kind that we know. The Bibliographical details will be found very useful and the Illustrations make it a fascinating book to turn over.

The Catholic Directory, Ecclesiastical Register and Almanack for the Year of Our Lord 1917. Pp. xxiv + 788. (Burns and Oates.) 1*s*. 6*d*. net.

The Dawn of Day. Volume for 1916. Pp. iv + 224. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s*. 4*d*. net.

INDEX TO VOL. LXXXIII.

ALLEN, Ven. W. C., *St. Mark*, 395
ANGLICANUS, *The Problem of Evil*, 402
APOCALYPSE (THE) AND THE PRESENT AGE [by the Rev. Dr. H. L. Goudge], 31 *sqq.*: special interest of the Apocalyptic world-drama for Christians to-day, 31; the Dramatis Personae, 32–4; the plot, 34; the first vision: our Lord as royal and universal Judge, 34; the judgement upon the Church: the Lord demands loyalty, purity, spiritual insight, 35–6; the judgement upon the world, 37 *sqq.*: love to man no substitute for love to God, 37; our complaints of the mystery of God's ways unjustified, 38; St. John's witness proves that God is at war with the world's sins, 39; the O.T. doctrine of the remnant restated, 41; vision of the life of the servants of God, 41; the method of God's judgements, 42; the Church's duty in relation to them: to receive the Divine message and to bear witness to the world, 44–5; conflict between the Church and the evil of the world, 45; Roman worship of Empire and Emperor paralleled in present-day Germany, 46–7; our own duty—to accept Christian ideals, 47; the certainty of victory over the forces of evil, 48; Divine judgements are themselves a Gospel, 49; the Church bound to bear moral witness against the world, 50; the Church is the City of God in the making, 51; God's purposes worked out by catastrophic intervention as well as by evolution, 52
ARCHBISHOPS' COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND STATE, pp. 347 *sqq.*: cause of present defects in relation between Church and State, 347; double aspect of the Church, 348; difficulties of Church legislation in Parliament, 348–9; Report of the Archbishops' Committee, 350; outline of their proposals, 350–4; conditions attached to proposed legislative powers of Church Council, 353; machinery for securing State control, 353–5; Dr. Rashdall's criticism of the Committee's proposals, 355–7; Dr. Henson's *Edinburgh Review* article on the subject, 357–8; other types of criticism, 358–9

BENSON, A. C., *Hugh: Memoirs of a Brother*, 211
BURRAGE, CHAMPLIN, *Nazareth and the Beginnings of Christianity*, 187

CANTERBURY, ARCHBISHOP OF, *Quit You Like Men*, 196
CAPES, Rev. W. W., *Registrum Iohannis Trefnant, Episcopi Herefordensis*, 197
CAREY, Rev. W. J., *Have you understood Christianity?*, 194
CHAPMAN, Rev. A. T., and STREANE, Rev. Dr. A. W., *Leviticus*, 184
CHURCH (THE) AND UNITY [by the Rev. E. Gordon Selwyn], 270 *sqq.*: failure of the

Branch-theory of the Church, 271; shifting of ground as to doctrine of Apostolic Succession, 271–2; Modernist tolerance of historical scepticism, 272; increasing prominence of the Eucharist as the centre of unity, 273; St. Clement quoted on the Apostolic appointment of bishops and presbyters, 274; explanation of St. Ignatius' silence on this point, 275; importance attached to 'validity' in the Primitive Church, 275–7; criticism of Dr. Hamilton's treatment of early church government, 277; analogy between ecclesiastical and industrial organization, 277–8; Mr. Spens' *Belief and Practice* quoted, 278–9; the Succession considered in regard to Nonconformists desiring reunion, 280; ecclesiastical humility a necessary preliminary to reunion, 281–2; the phrase 'the churches' a misnomer, 282; the One Church a reality, 283–4; the Church's organic unity, not mutual toleration of schism, the ideal to aim at, 285–6

CRAFER, Rev. Dr. T. W., *A Prophet's Visions and the War*, 416

CRESSWELL, Miss B. F., *Edwardian Inventories for City and County of Exeter*, 201

D'ARCY, C. F., Bishop of Down, *God and Freedom in Human Experience*, 399

DEEDES, Rev. CECIL, *Registrum Iohannis de Pontissara, Episcopi Wyntoniensis*, 197

DENISON, Rev. H. P., *Some Spiritual Lessons of the War*, 196; *The Lord in His Temple*, 417

Diocesis Londoniensis: Registrum Simonis de Sudbiria, 197

Diocesis Roffensis: Registrum Hamonis Hethe, 197

Diocesis Savesbiriensis: Registrum Simonis de Gandavo, 197

DODSON, Rev. T. H., *The Book of Jonah*, 394

DRAKE, Rev. F. W., *Masters of the Spiritul Life*, 193

DRIVER, Rev. Dr. S. R., *The Ideals of the Prophets*, 415

ELMSLIE, W. A. L., *The Books of Chronicles*, 184

GALLOWAY, Rev. Dr. G., *The Philosophy of Religion*, 409

GILES, Dr. HERBERT A., *Confucianism and its Rivals*, 410

GORDON, Rev. GEOFFREY, *An Interpreter of War, Habakkuk*, 416

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE [by the Rev. G. C. Richards], 174 *sqq.*: Sir Thomas Jackson's high qualifications as an authority, 174; the term 'Gothic' discussed, 174–5; difficulty in framing a satisfactory definition, 176; influence on architecture of the emancipation of the communes, 176; the yoke of symbolism, 177; the Perpendicular style, 177; rise of the architect in importance and social standing, 177; development of early French Gothic, 178–81; English Gothic, 181–2; Italian and Sicilian Gothic, 182–3

GREEN, J. R., *A Short History of the English People* (Epilogue by A. S. GREEN), 203

HALL, Dr. A. J., *Religious Education in Public Schools of State and City of New York*, 207

HANNAY, R. K., and Rev. Dr. HERKLESS, *The Archbishops of St. Andrews*, vol. v, 419

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

FOR

OCTOBER 1916 : JANUARY 1917

EDITED BY

ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON

VOLUME LXXXIII

LONDON

SPOTTISWOODE, BALLANTYNE & CO. LTD.

1 NEW-STREET SQUARE, E.C.

1917

CONTENTS

PAGE

THE NATIONAL MISSION: WHERE DOES THE DEFECT OF THE CHURCH LIE? By the Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, D.D. . 1

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND PRAYERS FOR THE DEPARTED. By the Ven. G. Gardner, Archdeacon of Aston . . 19

THE APOCALYPSE AND THE PRESENT AGE. By the Rev. H. L. Goudge, D.D., Canon of Ely 31

THE MIRACLES OF CHRIST AND MODERN SCIENTIFIC THEORY. By the Rev. W. Yorke Fausset, late Prebendary of Wells 53

THE WAR AND RELIGION. By the Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, D.D. 81

THE PRESENT POSITION OF PRAYER BOOK REVISION. By the Rev. A. Bevil Browne, Hanging Heaton, Yorks . . 111

THE PROBLEM OF THE LONDON CITY CHURCHES. By the Rev. J. H. B. Masterman, Rector of St. Mary-le-Bow, E.C. . 145

THE WAR 155

GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE. By the Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford 174

THE PROBLEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH. By the Rev. H. F. Hamilton, D.D., Ottawa 225

THE HYMNS OF ST. AMBROSE. By the Rev. A. S. Walpole, Hoggeston Rectory, Winslow 252

THE CHURCH AND UNITY. By the Rev. E. Gordon Selwyn, Warden of Radley 270

THE NATIONAL MISSION—A SUGGESTION, II. By the Rev. M. W. T. Conran, S.S.J.E. 286

WHAT IS CATHOLICISM? By the Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, D.D. 292

'JEAN BAROIS.' THE FRANCE OF YESTER-YEAR. By Miss H. Grierson 329

THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND STATE . 347

THE WAR: A NEW CRISIS 359

PROFESSOR HARNACK ON NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM. By the Rev. H. J. White, D.D., Professor of New Testament Literature, King's College, London 390

SHORT NOTICES 184, 439

PERIODICALS 214, 421

INDEX TO VOL. LXXXIII. 437

HARNACK, PROFESSOR, ON NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM [by the Rev. Dr. H. J. White], 390 *sqq.*: importance of the Vulgate for textual criticism of the N.T., 391; general results of Harnack's work summarized, 392; his handling of some individual passages criticized, 393

HEPHER, Rev. CYRIL, *The Fruits of Silence*, 190

HERKLESS, Rev. Dr., and R. K. HANNAY, *The Archbishops of St. Andrews*, vol. v, 419

HOLLAND, R., and HETTY LEE, *Problem of the Bible Class*, 209

HYMNS OF ST. AMBROSE, THE [by the Rev. A. S. Walpole], 252 *sqq.*: historical summary of circumstances in which the hymns were written, 253–257; difficulty in identifying genuine Ambrosian hymns, 257–8; first scientific attempts by the Benedictines of St. Maur, 259; serious objections to their canon, 260; Dr. Biraghi's three canons, 261; results yielded by examination of Milanese service-books, 262; St. Augustine's allusions to four of the hymns, 263; helpful characteristics, 264; metrical tests, 264–5; rhyme, 265–6; their literary character, 266–7; Archbishop Trench quoted, 266; Biraghi's list of eighteen genuine Ambrosian hymns, 267; some critical objections, 268–70

'JEAN BAROIS.' THE FRANCE OF YESTER-YEAR [by Miss H. Grierson], 329 *sqq.*: M. Martin du Gard's novel compared to a Cinema Play, 329; the Venture of Faith the chief subject of the book, 330; the author's own attitude, 330–1; Jean Barois' boyhood, 331–2; attends classes at the Sorbonne, 332; influence on him of Abbé Schertz, 332–3; resigns his lectureship and marries Cécile, 334; an ill-assorted marriage, 335; separation, 336; founding of *Le Semeur*, *ib.*; journalistic life in Paris, 337; 'L'Affaire Dreyfus,' 338; 'Conférence' at the Trocadéro on 'L'avenir de l'Incroyance,' *ib.*; narrow escape from death, 339; writes a 'Testament,' *ib.*; his quest for 'un équilibre,' 340; 'La Fêlure,' *ib.*; divergences of view arise in the staff of *Le Semeur*, 341; his daughter Marie visits him, 342; influence on him of her faith and life, *ib.*; he falls out of touch with the younger generation, 343; resigns editorship of *Le Semeur*, 344; is reconciled to his wife, *ib.*; friendship with Abbé Levys, 345; finds 'apaisement' at last, *ib.*; Cécile burns his 'Testament,' 346; a changed Paris, *ib.*

KERSCHENSTEINER, GEORG, *The Schools and the Nation*, 209

LACEY, Rev. T. A., *Nature and God discussed in Letters to a Questioner*, 402; *Nature, Miracle and Sin: A Study of St. Augustine's Conception of the Natural Order*, 403

LEE, HETTY, and R. HOLLAND, *Problem of the Bible Class*, 209

MARTINDALE, Rev. C. C., S.J., *Life of Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson*, 211

M'NEILE, Rev. Dr. A. H., *Self-training in Prayer*, 190

MIRACLES (THE) OF CHRIST AND MODERN SCIENTIFIC THEORY [by the Rev. W. Yorke

Fausset], 53 *sqq.*: change in our mental outlook caused by Evolution, 54; Darwin converted the hypothesis into a scientific theory, 55; Mozley's defence of miracles inadequate to-day, 56–7; Hume's standpoint, 56; Christianity a miraculous religion, 57 *sq.*; shrinkage in the limits claimed for the miraculous, 58; the imputation of Pantheism to Christianity, 58–9; influence of the 'Higher Criticism,' 59 *sq.*; and of the new psychology, 60–1; Dr. Dearmer quoted on hypnotism, 61; our Lord's miracles the 'unique manifestation of a unique Personality,' 62; the conception of 'personality,' the kernel of the problem, 62; Professor Haldane quoted, 63; conception of the Person of Christ in the Logos-doctrine and Pauline Theology, 63; Christ is in Himself the supreme Miracle, 64; the mechanical interpretation of facts of thought and consciousness inadequate, 64–5; M. Poincaré's *Dernières Pensées* quoted, 65–7; 'Nature not the whole of the reality apprehensible by man,' 67; possibilities of development latent in Christian belief, 68; the writer's view of Nature miracles as wrought by the Divine energy compressing a protracted process into a moment, 70; recent speculation on the *nature of Life*, 71 *sq.*; Bergson quoted, 71–2; Sir Oliver Lodge on Vitalism, 72; the Nature miracles of Christ worked 'in the power of the Spirit,' 73; Eucken's advocacy of the teleological view of the world, 74; his position as to miracles, 75–6; the view of the universe as a spiritual process ordered by the Divine mind, 77–8; the new biology reluctant to dogmatize, 79; Prof. Benjamin Moore's theory of a continuous creation, 79–80; in His miracles the Incarnate Son acted 'directly from the Father through the Spirit,' 80; the foundation facts of Christianity *sacramenta*, 81

Morison, Rev. Dr. E. F., *Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum auctore Tyrannio Rufino Aquileiensi presbytero*, and *Commentary on the Apostles' Creed by Tyrannius Rufinus*, 411

Moxon, Rev. R. S., *Commonitorium of Vincentius of Lerins*, 412

National Mission (The): Where does the Defect of the Church lie? [by the Rev. Dr. Headlam], 1 *sqq.*: the nation's failure in intellectual keenness, 2; and general easy-going acquiescence, 3; a Serbian priest on Anglicanism, 4; some causes of our mental sluggishness, 5; our inadequate conception of spiritual religion, 6; reasons for frequent failure of Missions, 6; the Rev. Walter Carey's books, 7; pulpit treatment of academic questions, 8–9; many Church services wanting in reality, 9; failure of preachers to deal with the problems of life, 10–12; the average working-man, 12; the modern soldier's conception of religion: quotations from *The Challenge* and Rev. G. E. Newsom, 13–15; some suggestions: revival of intellectual keenness in the clergy, 16; need of getting in touch with

the people, 16–17; and of simplicity of thought in handling deep problems, 17–19

NATIONAL MISSION—A SUGGESTION, II [by the Rev. M. W. T. Conran, S.S.J.E.], 286 *sqq.*: Dr. Inge on dominant ideas characteristic of an epoch, 286–7; message brought by the Methodist movement and the worship of the Sacred Heart, 287; our special needs to-day—(1) a watchword; (2) unity; (3) power; (4) reality; (5) action, 288–9; the Devotion of the Chaplet of Prayer advocated, 290–2

NEW TESTAMENT (THE) AND PRAYERS FOR THE DEPARTED [by the Ven. G. Gardner], 19 *sqq.*: Biblical silence on eschatological points, 20; ancient Hebrew thought about Sheol, 20; *Ecclesiasticus* quoted on the non-belief in a future existence, 21; gradual evolution of Hebrew thought about individual immortality, 22–3; our Lord's teaching on man's eternal future connotes uninterrupted existence, 23–5; faith in eternal life strengthened by the Resurrection, 25–6; early Christian belief in relation to the 'Last Things,' 26–8; rise of explicit Prayer for the Departed, 28; our relations with the unseen world, 29; quotations from representative Lutheran and Russian writers, 29–30; Christian thought on the intercessions of the Departed on our behalf, 30

PARRY, Rev. R. ST. J., *Romans*, 396

PERIODICALS, 214, 421

PLATT, FREDERIC, *Immanence and Christian Thought*, 401

PLUMMER, Rev. Dr. A., *St. Mark*, 395

Prayer, Concerning: its Nature, its Difficulties, and its Value, 404

PRESENT POSITION (THE) OF PRAYER BOOK REVISION [by the Rev. A. Bevil Browne], 111 *sqq.*: the 'Royal Letter of Business' quoted, 111; the proceedings of the Joint Committees of Convocation, 112; object of the present article, 113; pleas urged against the need of revision, 113; successive revisions of the Prayer Book, 114–5; proposals made by Convocation regarding (i) the Orderly Reading of Holy Scripture, 115–25; (ii) the Edification of the Congregation, 125–9; (iii) the Simplification of the Services, 129–33; (iv) the Problem of Variety of Use, 133–5; (v) Adaptation to Altered Circumstances, 136–42; some debated questions, 142–3; contemplated method of procedure, 143–4

PROBLEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH, THE [by the Rev. Dr. H. F. Hamilton], 225 *sqq.*: moral enthusiasm inspired by the British Empire, 226; England's predecessors in the race for Empire, 227; advance in civilization evokes a 'new' morality, 228; relations of Portuguese, Spanish, and Dutch with the new worlds in Fifteenth to Seventeenth centuries, 229–31; lack of self-restraint in early discoverers, 231–2; leading to deterioration in their own moral character, 232–3; early British administrators, 233; the case of Warren Hastings, 233–4; Britain's recognition of her responsibilities, 234; consequences of this benevo-

lent policy, 235–6; relations between mother-countries and their colonists, 236–7; granting of self-government to the British Colonies, 238; control of their foreign relations by the British Cabinet, 239; their development into Dominions, 239; the preservation of the Empire a guarantee of continued peace, 240–2; urgent need for readjusting its present political organization, 243; desirability of associating the Dominions with Great Britain in imperial administration, 244; questions of defence and control of foreign relations, 244–5; relations of the Dominions to the United Kingdom, 245–8; Mr. Curtis' scheme of Imperial Federation, 248; essential features of such schemes, 249; difficulties to be overcome, 250; constitutional changes necessary, 250–1; Mr. Curtis' treatment of the problem, 251–2

PROBLEM OF THE LONDON CITY CHURCHES, THE [by the Rev. J. H. B. Masterman], 145 *sqq.*: the mediaeval grouping of the City Churches, 145; changes caused by the Great Fire, 145–6; the Union of Benefices Act (1860), 146; the City Parochial Charities Act (1883), 146–7; unwise sequestration of endowed lectureships, 147; the resident population of the City, 147; spiritual provision for the daytime population, 147–8; present-day Sunday congregations and services, 148–9; revenues of the City Churches, 149; Mr. Charles Booth's suggestions, 149–50; general principles necessary to any scheme of reform: (i) further demolition of fabrics deprecated, 151; (ii) restoration of parochial life, 151; (iii) suggested uses for ex-Parish Churches, 152; (iv) administration of funds, 152; (v) the question of patronage, 153; pressing need for a courageous effort at reform, 154–5

Registrum Iohannis de Pontissara, Episcopi Wyntoniensis, ed. CECIL DEEDES, 197

Registrum Iohannis Trefnant, Episcopi Herefordensis, ed. W. W. CAPES, 197

ROPES, J. H., *The Epistle of St. James*, 397

RUSSELL, Rev. E. F., *Father Stanton's Last Sermons in St. Alban's, Holborn*, 418

SEATON, Rev. J. B., *The Mind of Our Lord*, 193

SMITH, Rev. H. MAYNARD, *Lectures on the Epistle of St. James*, 397

STOKES, A. P., *What Jesus Christ thought of Himself*, 194

STREANE, Rev. Dr. A. W., and CHAPMAN, Rev. A. T., *Leviticus*, 184

TAYLOR, Dr. H. O., *Deliverance*, 408

TWEEDIE, Rev. ANDREW, *A Sketch of Amos and Hosea*, 394

WAR, THE, 155 *sqq.*: German mentality, 155; reasons for German confidence, 156; our errors in talking too much (1) about the break-up of the Turkish Empire, 156; (2) about the punishment of the Hohenzollerns, 157; (3) about the re-arrangement of the map of Europe, 158; *résumé*

of events during July–September: East Africa, 159–60; Turkey, 160–5; Professor Trubetskoy on the Russian desire for Constantinople, 161; and on Russia's duty to Poland, 162–3; our mistakes in dealing with Turkey, 163–4; the Arab revolt, 164; events in Persia, 165; the German failure at Verdun, 165; the Russian advance, 166; the Anglo-French advance on the Somme, 166; the Italian successes, 167; Roumania's intervention, 168; the doctrine of one front, 169; importance of the Berlin-Constantinople railway, 169; the resuscitation of Serbia, 169; reasons for a strong advance from Salonika, 170; the tragi-comedy of Greece, 170–1; confidence of the Central Powers, 171; the task confronting Hindenburg, 171–2; reasons for Austro-German belief in their ultimate victory, 173; the Archbishop of Canterbury's London University sermon quoted, 173

WAR, THE: A NEW CRISIS, 359 *sqq.*; Prince von Bülow's *Imperial Germany*, 360–5; Naumann's *Central Europe*, 365–70; recent operations on the Somme, 370–1; the Italian advance on the Carso, 371; the intervention of Roumania, 371–2; German preparations for 1917, 373 *sqq.*; Turkish levies, 373; German man-power, 374; creation of new divisions, 375; Hindenburg's probable plans for the spring, 376; the new submarine activity, 377; renewal of Zeppelin attacks possible, 378; our difficulties on the Salonika front, 379–80; the recent change of Government, 380–5; why it was essential, 381; is Mr. Lloyd George equal to the task? 382–3; the work before us, 383–5; the German peace proposals, 386; the Allies' reply, 387; President Wilson's Note, 387–8; dangers of peace on German terms, 388–9; Mr. J. W. Headlam's *The Issue* quoted, 389; undoubted victory essential to Britain's safety, 389–90

WAR (THE) AND RELIGION [by the Rev. Dr. Headlam], 81 *sqq.*: striking difference between French and English writings on the war: detachment of English theologians, 83; directness of French views, 83–4; criticisms of some of these books: *The Faith and the War*, 84–6; Dr. Henson's *War-Time Sermons*, 86; the Rev. C. E. Osborne, 86; their differing speculations about the future, 87; the view that organized Christianity is responsible for the war unreasonable, 87; wars inevitable in the present condition of the human race, 88; the belief that this war will end war unwarranted, 89; falseness of the German theory that war in itself is good, 90–1; Dr. Rashdall's discussion of the problem of the existence of evil, 91–3; the explanation found in St. Thomas Aquinas' teaching on the limitation of the divine power, 94; striking case of probation of character produced by the war, 95; problem of reconciling war with Christian morality, 95; illogical position of the Quakers, 95–6; Dr. Goudge's attempt to reconcile Christian morality with the action of the armed state, 96–7; Christianity gives not rules to be obeyed but principles to be

grasped, 98–9; moral rules remain the same, but circumstances differ, 99–100; the theory that the war is a judgement of God criticized, 100; Mgr. Mignot quoted, 100–1; charges against English society by various preachers, 101; Bergson's *Signification de la Guerre* quoted, 102–3; M. Loisy on the attitude of the Pope, 104; the Archbishop of Paris' apology for the Holy See, 105–6; religious purposes involved in the war, 107–10: the attempt to arouse Islam to a sacred war, 107; reasons for Ultramontane sympathy with Germany, 108; Russia as the champion of the Orthodox, 109; English policy must be that of religious liberty, 109–10

WATSON, Rev. Dr. H. A., *The Mysticism of St. John's Gospel*, 190

WESTLAKE, Rev. H. F., *New Guide to Westminster Abbey*, 206

WHAT IS CATHOLICISM? [by the Rev. Dr. Headlam], 292 *sqq.*: difficulty of defining what is really 'Catholic,' 293; the Rev. R. J. Campbell's *Spiritual Pilgrimage*, 294–8: his account of an Irish Presbyterian Sacrament Sabbath, 294–5; London's need of 'preaching stations,' 295–6; lack of intellectual interest among Anglicans, 296; Mr. Campbell on the historic episcopate as a basis of unity, 297; a conditional re-ordination of Nonconformists suggested, 298; Bishop Weston's *Fulness of Christ*, 299–303: quotations illustrating its inconclusive methods of argument, 299–301; his definite statement regarding Kikuyu, 302; criticisms, 303; Bishop Chandler's *The English Church and Reunion*, 303–7: a suggested Eirenikon, 304; sound criticism of the modern critical attitude, 305; importance of preserving individual responsibility, *ib.*; *Ecclesia Anglo-Catholica* the Catholic Church for free men, 306; Dr. Chandler's conception of Christianity a narrow one, 307; Bishop Gore's *Manual of Membership*, 307–15: Dr. Inge's perverse criticism of this book, 307–11; Bishop Gore's overemphasis on the institutional side of religion, 311–13; his confusion between the Church as it is and as he wishes it to be, 313–4; his unscientific use of N.T. authority, 314–5; notices of books by Mr. Carey, Mr. Burton, Dr. Hodges, and Mr. Grane, 315–6; the three Bishops' presentation of Christianity examined from the writer's own standpoint, 316–8; failure of these works to answer the questions What is the Church? 318–20, and What is Catholic? 320; restatement and examination of Catholic doctrine as to (1) the Scriptures, 320; (2) the Church and the Creed, 321–3; (3) the Sacraments, 323–5; (4) organization, 325–6; stress laid by these writers on the authority and discipline of the Church, 326–9

REPEAL OF THE WELSH CHURCH ACT.

THE leaders of the Church patriotically submitted to forego, in the interests of National Unity, the measure of relief which the late Liberal Government themselves proposed as just, and with regard to which Mr. Asquith admitted that they 'were entitled to insist upon the prosecution of this Bill, whilst we (the Government) were bound to give it all the support in our power to enable it to pass into law.'

The last day of the War, therefore, will see the Church in Wales deprived of its ancient endowments, unless Parliamentary action is taken in the meantime.

Churchmen of every political party are earnestly invited to continue their support of the Central Church Defence Committee so that it may maintain its organisation, and, when national conditions permit, launch an effective campaign for the repeal of the Welsh Church Act.

CHURCH COLLECTIONS, however small, will be most gratefully received.

Cheques (crossed Messrs. Hoare) may be sent to the Secretary at the offices of the Committee in the Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.

T. MARTIN TILBY, *Secretary.*

The Mission of the Church to her Soldier & Sailor Sons

CHURCH ARMY RECREATION HUTS, TENTS and CLUBS

in all parts of the United Kingdom, in Flanders (many under shell-fire), France, Malta, Egypt, Salonica, British East Africa, Mesopotamia, and India. Others are being added almost daily.

SPECIAL HUTS AT NAVAL AND AIR BASES FOR MEN OF THE FLEETS.

Each Hut, &c., provides facilities for Reading, Writing Letters, Music and Entertainments, Light Refreshments, Drying Clothes, some with Hot and Cold Baths; Quiet Corner for Private Prayer and Meditation, all requisites for Celebrations of Holy Communion and other Sunday and Weekday Services; and a WARM WELCOME from the experienced Church Army Evangelist-in-Charge.

HUTS COST £300; Section of Hut £20.
TENTS COST £150; Equipment £100.
Week's Working £5 Abroad, £2 at Home.

MORE HUTS, &c., URGENTLY REQUIRED

Cheques, &c., should be crossed 'Barclays', a/c Church Army,' payable to PREBENDARY CARLILE, D.D., Hon. Chief Secretary, Headquarters, Bryanston Street, Marble Arch, W.

Spottiswoode, Ballantyne & Co. Ltd., Printers, Colchester, London and Eton.